

RESOLUTIONS ON MATTERS OF GENERAL
PUBLIC INTEREST.

CANCELLATION OF RULES *re* REMOVAL OF TIMBER AND
BAMBOOS FROM PRIVATE HOLDINGS.

PRESIDENT : The first resolution which stands in the name of Tariat Kunjitomman runs as follows ;—

This Council recommends to the Government that the present rule which lays down that a pass from the Forest Department is necessary for felling and removing the trees and bamboos standing on private lands be cancelled.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*) : ജനങ്ങളുടെപേരിൽ പതിവുഭൂമികളിൽ നിന്നും വൃക്ഷങ്ങളെയും മുകളേയും മുറിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു പോകുന്നതിന് ഫാറസ്റ്ററിപ്പാട്ട്മെന്റിൽനിന്നു പ്രീപാസ് വാങ്ങണമെന്നുള്ള വ്യവസ്ഥയെ റദ്ദു ചെയ്യണമെന്ന് ഈ യോഗം ഗവണ്മെന്റിനോടു ശുപാർശ ചെയ്യുന്നു ഇതാണു എന്റെ പ്രമേയം.

ജനങ്ങൾ നികുതി കൊടുക്കുന്ന ഭൂമികളിൽ നട്ടുണ്ടാക്കുന്നതൊരു നെ മുള്ളുണ്ടാകുന്നതൊരു ആയ ചെടികളേയും വൃക്ഷങ്ങളേയും ഇഷ്ടം പോലെ എടുത്തുപയോഗിക്കുന്നതിനു ഓരോ പൗരനും സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യാലായ അവകാശം പാലിക്കപ്പെട്ടേണ്ടതാണ്. ഇപ്പോൾ ആ അവകാശത്തിന് ബാധകമായിട്ടാണു പ്രീപാസ് വ്യവസ്ഥയിരിക്കുന്നത്. ഈ രാജ്യം ഒരു കഷ്ടത രാജ്യമാണ്. കഷ്ടതകളുടെ ന്യായമായ സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യാവകാശത്തെ ഗവണ്മെന്റിൽ നിന്നും പൂർണ്ണമായി അനുവദിച്ചുകൊടുത്ത് അവരെ കൃഷിവിഷയത്തിൽ പ്രോത്സാഹിപ്പിക്കേണ്ടത് ഓരോ രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ അഭിവൃദ്ധിക്ക് അത്യാവശ്യമാണ്. കേരളത്തിനെ ഇൻഡ്യയുടെ ആരാമമെന്നു വിദേശികൾ പറയുന്നു. ഇൻഡ്യയുടെ തോട്ടമായ കേരളത്തിലേ അതിപ്രധാനമായ ഭാഗം അടങ്ങുന്ന തിരുവിതാംകൂർ രാജ്യനിവാസികളുടെ തൊഴിൽ കൃഷിയാണ്. ഇവിടത്തെ ഭൂമികളിൽ ധാന്യം മാത്രമല്ല വൃക്ഷങ്ങളും ധാരാളമുണ്ട്. അതുകൊണ്ടാണു ഇൻഡ്യയുടെ തോട്ടമെന്നു പറയുന്നത്. ഭൂമി ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാർക്ക് അതിലുള്ള ധാന്യങ്ങൾക്ക് മാത്രമല്ലെല്ലാ ഉടമസ്ഥാവകാശമുള്ളത്. പുരയിടങ്ങളിൽ ധാരാളമായി വൃക്ഷങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ട്. ഈ രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ ഭൂപ്രകൃതിയും ശീതോഷ്ണസ്ഥിതിയും ധാന്യങ്ങൾക്കും വൃക്ഷങ്ങൾക്കും യോജിച്ചവയാണ്.

ഇങ്ങനെയുള്ള വൃക്ഷങ്ങളെ ഉപയോഗിക്കാൻ നിവർത്തിയില്ലെന്നാണ് ഈ പ്രീപാസ് വ്യവസ്ഥ കൊണ്ടുവന്നിരിക്കുന്നത്. ഒരു പാസ്സ് മേടിക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള ശ്രമവും അതിനുള്ള കഷ്ടതയും എന്തെല്ലാമാണെന്നു

[Mr. Tariatu Kunjittomman.]

അതു അനുഭവിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളവർക്ക് നല്ലവണ്ണം അറിയാൻ നിവർത്തിയുള്ള മലയോരങ്ങളിൽ മാത്രമല്ല സമുദ്രതീരങ്ങളിലും ഈ വ്യവസ്ഥ ഒരുപോലെ ബാധിക്കുന്നുണ്ട്.

ഈ റൗൺമാർ ഇരിക്കുന്ന പുരയിടത്തിൽ ഉള്ളമുളയെപ്പോലും മുറിച്ച് അടുത്തസ്ഥലത്തേക്കു വണ്ടിയിൽ കൊണ്ടുപോകണമെങ്കിൽ ഫാറസ്സ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റുകാരുടെ പാസ്സുവേണമെന്നാണുചട്ടം. റിസർവ് വനങ്ങൾ ഇല്ലാത്ത ചേർത്തല അമ്പലപ്പുഴ മുതലായ താലൂക്കുകളിലുള്ള ഒരു പുരയിടത്തിൽ നിന്നും മരുതൊ വെൺതേക്കൊ മുളയൊ മുറിച്ച് കരവഴിക്കൊ തോട്ടുവഴിക്കൊകടത്തിക്കൊണ്ടുപോകണമെങ്കിൽ പാസ്സുവേണം. മുള തലച്ചുമടായിവേണമെങ്കിൽ കൊണ്ടുപോകാമെന്നൊരു ഒഴിവുണ്ട്. മരങ്ങൾക്കു അതുമാല്ല. പാസ്സില്ലാതെത്തന്നാൽ ഫാറസ്സ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റുകാർ പിടികൂടി കേസാക്കുകയും തൻനിമിത്തം ശിക്ഷ അനുഭവിക്കുന്നതിന് ഇടയാകുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നു. ഈ വിധത്തിലുള്ള അസാധാരണമാണ് പൗരത്തിന്നു ഇപ്പോൾ ഉള്ളത്. എന്നാൽ ഗവണ്മെന്റിന് ഈ പ്രീപാസ് വ്യവസ്ഥകൊണ്ട് യാതൊരു ആദായവുമില്ല. ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിലെ ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരിൽ ചിലർക്ക് ഇതുകൊണ്ട് ആദായമില്ലെന്നു പറയുവാൻ പാടില്ല. എന്നാൽ ആ വക സംഗതികളെയെല്ലാം തുറന്ന് ഇവിടെ പറയണമെന്ന് ഞാൻ വിചാരിക്കുന്നില്ല. ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റുദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരെ പ്രലോഭിപ്പിക്കുന്നതിനതകുന്ന ഈ വ്യവസ്ഥയെ—കഷ്ടകാര്യങ്ങളുടെ സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യാവകാശത്തിനു ബാധകമായ ഈ ശൃംഖലയെ—ജനക്ഷേമത്തെ കാംക്ഷിച്ച് ഗവണ്മെന്റ് ഉടൻ തകർക്കേണ്ടതാണ്. ഉൾനാടുകളിലേയും വിശിഷ്ട മലയോരങ്ങളിലേയും ജനങ്ങൾക്കാണ് ഈ പാസ് വ്യവസ്ഥ കൊണ്ട് അധികമുപദ്രവം. ആ സ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽ നിന്നും പ്രജാസഭയിൽ വരുന്ന മെമ്പർമാർ പല അവസരങ്ങളിലും ഇതിനെപ്പറ്റി പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ട്. അവരിൽ ചിലരെ ഇവിടെ പറയാം. ൧൯൦൮-ൽ പത്തനാപുരം മെമ്പർ മിസ്റ്റർ നാരായണൻ പത്തനാഭൻ, ൧൯൧൦-ൽ പത്തനാപുരം മെമ്പർ മി: പരമേശ്വരൻപിള്ള, ൧൯൧൨-ൽ എന്റെ മാന്യസ്നേഹിതൻ കല്ല്യം മെമ്പർ മിസ്റ്റർ കുമാരപിള്ള, ൧൯൧൪-ൽ പത്തനാപുരം മെമ്പർ മി: പരമേശ്വരൻ പത്തനാഭൻ ഇവരെല്ലാം ഇതിന്റെ ദോഷത്തെപ്പറ്റി വിവരിച്ച് ഈ പ്രീപാസ്സെപ്പാടു നിരത്തിക്കളയണമെന്നുതന്നെ പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. അതിനുശേഷം ഈ പ്രീപാസ്സുസമ്പ്രദായം ഒന്നു ഭേദപ്പെടുത്തി. അപേക്ഷകൊടുത്ത മൂന്നുമാസത്തിനുള്ളിൽ പാസ്സുകൊടുക്കണമെന്നായിരുന്നു അതിൽ പറഞ്ഞിരുന്നത്. എന്നിട്ടും വലിയ പ്രയോജനമൊന്നും

ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നില്ല. ന. മാസത്തിനകം പ്രീപാസ്സുകൊടുക്കണമെന്നുള്ളതിനുള്ള ന. കൊല്ലം കഴിഞ്ഞാലും ഭൂപ്രയംകൂടാതെ ചിലക്കു പ്രീപാസ്സ് കിട്ടുകയില്ലെന്നായി. എൻ. എ-ൽ വാണ്ടും മുനിസിപ്പാലിറ്റി മെമ്പർ മി: പി. എസ്. മരുതനായകംപിള്ള ഈ പ്രീപാസ്സുപ്പാടുനിർത്തണമെന്നു പറഞ്ഞു. മുവാറ്റുപുഴ മെമ്പർ ഞാൻ തന്നെയും പറഞ്ഞു. എൻ. എ-ൽ പത്മനാഭപുരം മുനിസിപ്പാലിറ്റി മെമ്പർ എൻ. എ-ൽ തൊടുപുഴ മെമ്പർ മി: ശങ്കരയ്യയും എൻ. എ-ൽ വിളവങ്കോട്ട മെമ്പർ മി: ആർ. നാരായണപിള്ളയും എൻ. എ-ൽ കല്ലൂർ മെമ്പർ മി: അയ്യൻപിള്ള മാതേവൻപിള്ളയും ഇതിനെപറ്റി പ്രജാസഭയിൽ പ്രസ്താവിച്ചു.

എൻ. എ-ൽ ഇതിന്റെ പരിഹാരത്തിനായി ഒരു കമ്മിറ്റി ഏർപ്പെടുത്തി അതായത് പ്രീപാസ്സ് സിസ്റ്റംകൊണ്ടുള്ള ഭോഷങ്ങളെ അന്വേഷിച്ചറിയുന്നതിന് അനുജോഗസ്ഥന്മാരും ഉജോഗസ്ഥന്മാരും അടങ്ങിയ ഒരു കമ്മിറ്റിയായിരുന്നു അത്. എന്നാൽ അനുജോഗസ്ഥന്മാരുടേയും ഉജോഗസ്ഥന്മാരുടേയും ഭൂരിപക്ഷാഭിപ്രായം വ്യത്യസ്തമായിരുന്നതിനാൽ അതുകൊണ്ടു പറയത്തക്ക ഉപയോഗം സിദ്ധിച്ചില്ല. ഇതുപോലെ പ്രജാസഭയുടെ പല യോഗങ്ങളിലും, പല താലൂക്കുകളിലെ മെമ്പർമാരും മുനിസിപ്പാലിറ്റി മെമ്പർമാരും ഈ പ്രീപാസ്സ് സിസ്റ്റം നിർത്തി പൌരന്മാരുടെ ന്യായമായ സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യത്തേയും അവകാശത്തേയും സാരക്ഷിക്കണമെന്നും ജനങ്ങളുടെ കഷ്ടതകളെ ഇല്ലാതാക്കണമെന്നും ശക്തിയുക്തമായി പ്രതിവാദിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. ആ കമ്മിറ്റിയിൽ ഉള്ളവരിൽ ഭിന്നാഭിപ്രായക്കാരുടെ റിപ്പോർട്ടും ഗവണ്മെൻറിലേക്കു എഴുതി അയച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. എന്നാൽ അവർ എന്തഭിപ്രായമാണ് രേഖപ്പെടുത്തിട്ടുള്ളത് എന്നു ഇതുവരെ അറിഞ്ഞിട്ടില്ല. അവരുടെ അഭിപ്രായം ജനസാമാന്യത്തിനു ഗുണകരമാണോ അതല്ലാ ഭോഷകരമാണോ എന്നു വെളിവാക്കാൻ ഗവണ്മെൻറു ഇതുവരെ തുനിഞ്ഞിട്ടില്ല. അതിന്റെ കാപ്പി മേശമേൽ വച്ചിട്ടും ഇല്ല. ആ ഭിന്നാഭിപ്രായമൊ ഭൂരിപക്ഷാഭിപ്രായമൊ, ഉജോഗസ്ഥന്മാർക്കുമാത്രം മനസ്സിലാക്കുന്നതിനല്ല അതിനെ മെമ്പർമാരുടെ അറിവിലേക്കും പബ്ലിക്കിന്റെ അറിവിലേക്കുവേണ്ടി മേശമേൽ വയ്ക്കേണ്ടത് നന്ത്യാവശ്യമാണ്. അങ്ങനെ ചെയ്തിരുന്നു എങ്കിൽ എനിക്കു വീണ്ടും ഇതു കൊണ്ടുവരേണ്ട ആവശ്യമില്ലാതിരുന്നേനെ. ഇപ്പോഴും ഈ വിഷയത്തിൽ ജനസാമാന്യത്തിന്റെ സങ്കടത്തിനു യാതൊരു ശമനവും ഉണ്ടായിട്ടില്ല. ജനസാമാന്യത്തിനെ ഒരുപോലെ സങ്കടപ്പെടുത്തിക്കൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്നു എന്നുമാത്രമല്ല ജനങ്ങളുടെ അവകാശത്തിനു ബാധകവുമായിരിക്കുന്നു.

[Mr. Tariatu Kunjittomman.]

നികുതി കൊടുക്കുന്ന പുരയിടങ്ങളിൽനിന്നും വൃക്ഷങ്ങളെ മുറിച്ചു സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യമായി കൊണ്ടുപോയി ഉപയോഗിക്കാൻ വയ്യാ എന്നുവന്നാൽ പിന്നെ എന്തു രക്ഷയാണ് ജനങ്ങൾക്കുള്ളത്. വ്യവസായവിഷയത്തിലുള്ള സൗകര്യം ഈ രാജ്യത്തു വളരെ കുറവാണ്. അനിയന്ത്രിതമായ വ്യവസായസ്വാതന്ത്ര്യവും കച്ചവടസ്വാതന്ത്ര്യവും പാശ്ചാത്യരാജ്യങ്ങളിൽ എത്രത്തോളം ആവശ്യമാണോ അത്രത്തോളം ഇൻഡ്യക്കും വിശേഷിച്ചു തിരുവിതാംകൂറിനും അനിയന്ത്രിതമായ കഷ്ടകസ്വാതന്ത്ര്യം അത്യാവശ്യമാണ്. ഇവയ്ക്ക് കൃഷിവൃത്തികൊണ്ടല്ലാതെ മറ്റൊരുതരത്തിലും ഉപജീവനമാർഗ്ഗം ഇല്ല. വൃക്ഷങ്ങളെ മുളയ്ക്കാ ഒന്നും മുറിക്കാൻ പാടില്ല. അഥവാ അങ്ങിനെ വല്ലപ്പോഴും സാധിച്ചുകിട്ടുന്നു എങ്കിൽ അതു സാധനത്തിന്റെ വിലയിൽ കവിഞ്ഞു പണം ചിലവാക്കിയാൽ മാത്രമേ സാധിക്കുകയുള്ളൂ. ഈ മാതിരിയുള്ള ചിലവുകൾ കഴിച്ചു വല്ലതും ഇണം ഉണ്ടെങ്കിൽ തന്നെ അതു തുച്ഛവുമാണ്. ഈ മാതിരിയെ വ്യവസ്ഥ ഇരിക്കുന്നതും മോഷ്ടാക്കൾക്കു ഒരു പ്രേരകമായിട്ടാണിരിക്കുന്നത്. ജനങ്ങൾക്കു ഗുരുന്തരമില്ലാതാകുമ്പോഴാണ് ഇങ്ങിനെയുള്ള സംഗതികൾക്കുപോകുന്നത്. ഗവണ്മെൻറു ചെന്നാവിൽ പണം ഉള്ളതുകൊണ്ട്, പണമുള്ള ജനങ്ങൾ അത് ചിലവാക്കുന്നതു ഭയപ്പെട്ടു ഫീസുതടയ്ക്കു സർട്ടിഫിക്കറ്റുകൂടാതെ പാടില്ലാ എന്നു പറയുന്നതു വളരെ കഷ്ടമാണ്. അഗ്രിക്കൽചർ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറിൽനിന്നും കുറെ സ്ഥലമെടുത്തു കൃഷിചെയ്യുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു ജനങ്ങൾക്കു കൃഷിചെയ്യുന്നതിന് ആ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറുജ്യോഗസ്ഥന്റെ അനുവാദം വേണമെന്നു പറയുന്നതും ജനങ്ങൾക്കു ഉപദ്രവകരവും കഷ്ടതയുമാണ്. അതുപോലെയാണ് ഈ പ്രീപാസ്റ്റ്സിസ്റ്റം നിലനിന്നുവരുന്നതുകൊണ്ടുള്ള ദോഷം.

MR. KURANDIPALLIL R. RAMAN PILLAI (Quilon): ഈ പ്രീപാസ്റ്റ്സിസ്റ്റം കൊച്ചി രാജ്യത്തുണ്ടോ? -

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha): കൊച്ചി രാജ്യത്തോ ബ്രിട്ടീഷ് മലബാറിലോ മൈസൂരിലോ ഈ ഏർപ്പാട് ഇല്ല.

MR. M. N. PILLAI (Trivandrum): തേക്കം ഈടിയും ഇതിൽ സംബന്ധിക്കുന്നുണ്ടോ?

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha): ഇല്ലാ. മുള ഉൾപ്പെടെയുള്ള ജനങ്ങൾക്കു വളരെ അത്യാവശ്യമാണ്. ഒരു രാജമരിച്ച് ഹനു അടിയന്ത്രത്തിനു പുറകെത്തന്നതിനു കുറെ മുള ആവ

ശ്രമങ്ങളിൽ സുഖക്കേടുതടങ്ങുന്നതിന്നു രണ്ടുമാസത്തിനുമുമ്പ് അപേക്ഷിച്ചു പാസ്സ്മേടിച്ചു വച്ചുകൊള്ളണം. അതുപോലെ വിറകിനു ആവശ്യമുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ വളരെക്കാലത്തിനു മുമ്പെതന്നെ അപേക്ഷിച്ചുകൊള്ളണം. ഒരു ഭവനം നന്നാക്കുന്നതിനു സ്വന്തപുരയിടത്തിലെ വൃക്ഷങ്ങളെ ഉപയോഗിക്കാൻപാടില്ലാതെ ആയിതീർന്നിരിക്കുന്നു. ഇതുകൊണ്ടു ഗവണ്മെൻറിനു യാതൊരു ആദായവുമില്ല. അതുകൊണ്ടു ഈ വിധത്തിലുള്ള അസ്വാതന്ത്ര്യത്തെ നിവർത്തിക്കൊണ്ടുപോകുന്നതിൽ യാതൊരു ആവശ്യവുമില്ല. ഫാറസ്റ്റ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെൻറുജോഗസ്ഥന്മാർക്കു ഇപ്പോൾ നാട്ടിൻപുറങ്ങളിൽ ചുറ്റിനടക്കുന്നതിനല്ലാതെ റിസർവ്വ് സൂക്ഷിക്കുന്നതിന് ശ്രദ്ധാലുക്കളായി കാണുന്നില്ല. കുടികളുടെ പുരയിടത്തിൽനിന്നും തടികളെ മുറിച്ചുകൊണ്ടുപോകുന്നതിന്നും സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യമായി ഉപയോഗിക്കുന്നതിന്നും ക്രയവിക്രയം ചെയ്യുന്നതിന്നും സൗകര്യം ഉണ്ടെങ്കിൽ മാത്രമേ ജനങ്ങൾക്കു ഇണം ഉണ്ടാകയുള്ളൂ. അതുകൊണ്ടു ഗവണ്മെൻറിനു ദോഷമില്ല ഇണമെയുള്ളൂ. ധർമ്മരാജ്യമെന്ന പേർ കേട്ടിട്ടുള്ള ഈ രാജ്യത്തെ പൌരന്മാർ ഗവണ്മെൻറിന്റെ നല്ല പേരിനേയും ജനങ്ങളുടെ രക്ഷയേയും ധർമ്മരാജ്യത്തെ ഏതൊരു അപേക്ഷയോടുകൂടി നിങ്ങളുടെ ഏല്പാവരുടേയും സ്വീകരണത്തിനായി ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ സമർപ്പിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): Sir, Mr. Kunjithomman's resolution is not new to this Council. He has brought this subject before this House on several occasions even by proposing cuts on the allotment for the Forest Department.

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): May I know whether the Conservator accepts the resolution or opposes it?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): Let the member wait till I finish.

It is true, Sir, that during the war there was large demand for timber from outside the State and that resulted in busy trade in timber. In those days there was no regular set of rules nor was any procedure laid down with regard to the issue of passes for private timber. Several representations were brought before the Assembly in regard to this question and as a result the Government passed a set of rules regulating the procedure to be adopted in the issue of passes for the transport of timber. These rules were working for nearly seven or eight years but it was found in practical working that there were certain difficulties which could not be easily got over. One of the difficulties was the rule that necessitated the production of a certificate from the Proverthikar to show that the land belonged to the applicant. On account of large of puduval registries it became increasingly difficult for the Forest

[Mr. R. Dhanukoti Pillai.]

Department to know whether the applicant was the real owner or not. In such cases we had to request the Land Revenue Department to arrange for the prompt issue of certificates by the Proverthikars. There were such incidental difficulties in the working of those rules. The number of applications for private passes was also so much that the work thrown on the Forest Department on this account was not a little. Naturally, therefore, there was some delay in the issue of passes. But all the same when the armistice was concluded there was not much of demand for private timber. However, the difficulties the people had undergone on account of the new rules was brought once again in the Assembly, and I think also before this Council; and the Government appointed a committee consisting of four members elected by this Council and also a few official members, including the Land Revenue Commissioner and one of the Senior Dewan Peishkars. The committee went into the whole question and also discussed the several ways in which redress could be given to the people. As a result of this discussion the committee drafted a set of rules and submitted it to Government. The Government accepted the rules and they were published in the *Gazette* in January 1924. Since then these rules have been in operation and now there has not been any complaint with regard to the hardship caused by the rules. An interpellation was asked some time ago asking for information as to the number of applications that had been received since the introduction of these rules, the number of applications that were disposed of and also the period taken for the disposal of such applications. We collected the information from the several divisions and found that in the Northern Division, wherein Mr. Kunjitomman's constituency lies, there were 43 applications for the issue of passes for the transport of private timber; and all these 43 applications were disposed of immediately and there was a delay of just a fortnight in the case of only one application. On the whole, 1,083 applications were received out of which 1,071 were disposed of without delay. In the case of 6 only of these 1,083, there was a delay ranging from a fortnight to three months; and in the case of one of these six the delay of three months was due to the fact that a counter claim was set up and that had to be investigated. That was the only cause of the delay.

So far as the Forest Department is concerned, we have been doing everything possible in the matter. There is also provision made in the new set of rules that in no case should the delay exceed a fortnight and that there should be no delay on the part of the subordinates of the Department. According to the existing rules the Ranger is permitted to issue passes without the production of the Proverthikar's certificate if he is satisfied that the land belongs to the applicant. If he has any doubt about that the Ranger is directed to write to the Proverthikar directly. The Land Revenue Commissioner who, as I have already stated, was also a member of the committee has issued instructions to his subordinates that in such references by the Range Officer the Proverthikars should *immediately* reply them, or at any rate, should reply

within *seven* days. So, at present, there is absolutely no room for any delay in the issue of the Proverthikar's certificate.

With regard to the issue of passes by the Range Officers, the whole State is divided into two sections, a scheduled area and an area outside this schedule. With regard to the latter the Range Officer is empowered to issue passes within a fortnight. In the case of the area within the schedule limits the Range Officer has to investigate the claims and then send the application within a week to the Division Officer who in his turn has been asked to see that the pass is issued within a fortnight after receipt of the application.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): We here are hardly able to hear the member at all.

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): So far as I have been able to see no case of delay has been reported to me or to any of the Division Officers.

Mr. Kunjitomman was saying that the Government have no right to derive any profit by imposing such restrictions on the use of private property by the owner. That is a big question and I candidly admit that I cannot say anything in regard to it. These transport rules are not peculiar to Travancore or to any part of India. Even in Germany they have a similar set of rules for the transport of timber from private holdings. Somebody said that there were no transport rules in Malabar. There are similar rules for each District in the Madras Presidency; but certain Districts are exempted from these rules, since there are no forests there. It is a mistake to say that there are no rules for Malabar.

Mr. Kunjitomman was also saying something with regard to the transport of bamboos. Bamboo, as every one is aware, occurs in private lands mostly in North Travancore. So far as the Forest Department is concerned we do not at all interfere with the removal of bamboo in those places. In the interest of the protection of the State Forests some restriction is imposed in the removal of bamboos from areas adjoining forests; and a pass is necessary for that purpose. Even in such places pass is not necessary for the removal of bamboo for *bona fide* consumption. It is necessary only if it is transported for purposes of trade.

MR. A. J. JOHN (*Vaikam*): Are there such rules in Cochin and Mysore?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): I do not know whether there are such rules in Cochin.

MR. C. P. TARAKAN (*Kunnathnad*): Does the Conservator say that there are no forests in Cochin?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): Not much; there may be some little left.

MR. KURANDIPALLIL R. RAMAN PILLAI (*Quilon*): Are there such rules in Mysore?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): In Mysore, I know there are transport rules in regard to sandalwood.

It is only when bamboo is sought to be transported from private land for trade purposes that a pass is insisted upon. I may also say in this connection that there is very little bamboo available in private lands. We have had to issue passes for bamboos only in very rare instances. I find that there has been only two applications for the transport of bamboos to British India, and that for trade purposes.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): May I know from the Conservator whether, since the same resolution was discussed in this House on the last occasion, any complaint has been received either by the Conservator or by any of his subordinate officers?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): I do not think there was any resolution passed by the council on this subject before.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): May I know whether in the light of the discussion here, the Conservator has issued any instructions to his subordinate officers not to cause any unnecessary delay in this matter?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): The rules issued by Government provide that in no case should applications be delayed for more than a fortnight.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): Apart from the provision of the rules, may I know whether by any separate communication the Conservator has directed his subordinate officers not to cause any delay on this matter?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): There was no necessity for that. Out of 1,083 applications there were only 6 that were delayed, and out of these 6 there was only 1 in which it was delayed for three months; and that delay, as I said, was due to a counter claim requesting the department not to issue the pass. That had to be investigated before the issue of the pass.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): പ്രി പാസ്സിനു കാലതാമസം വരുത്തി എന്നു വല്ല റിപ്പോർട്ടും ഡിവിഷൻ ഫോറസ്റ്റാഫീസർ കൺസർവേറ്ററുക്കുയക്കാരണ്ടോ?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): അയക്കുറില്ല.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): പിന്നെ എങ്ങിനെയാണു് താമസം വരുന്നു എന്നു അറിയുന്നതു്?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): അതിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ച കൺസിൽ ചോദ്യങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നതുകൊണ്ടുറിയാം.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): പിന്നീടു് അതിനെപ്പറ്റി അന്വേഷിച്ചോ?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): അതിനു അവസരം വന്നിട്ടില്ല.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ഓരോ സക്കീട്ടിലും പൌരന്മാരെക്കണ്ടു ചോദിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): പൌരന്മാർക്കു ഇങ്ങോട്ടു പറയുന്നതിന് വിരോധമില്ല.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): അങ്ങോട്ടു ചോദിച്ചതന്നെ അതിനു പരിഹാരം ഉണ്ടാക്കേണ്ടതുകൂടി ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റു മേലധ്യക്ഷന്റെ ചുമതലയല്ലേ?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): സങ്കടമുണ്ടെന്നു അറിഞ്ഞാൽ അല്ലേ അന്വേഷിക്കേണ്ട ആവശ്യമുള്ളു?

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ഈ വിഷയത്തിൽ സങ്കടമുണ്ടെന്നു കൗൺസിലിലും അസംബ്ലിയിലും തുടൻ പറയുകയും അതിലേക്കു ഒരു കമ്മിറ്റി ഏല്പിട്ടുത്തി റിപ്പോർട്ടു സമർപ്പിക്കുകയും ചെയ്തു. പിന്നെയും അതിൽ സങ്കടമുണ്ടോ എന്നന്വേഷിക്കേണ്ടതു ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റു മേലധ്യക്ഷന്റെ ചുമതലയല്ലേ?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): ജനങ്ങൾക്കു സങ്കടമില്ലല്ലോ?

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ജനങ്ങൾക്കു സങ്കടമില്ലെന്നു ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിൽനിന്നും റിപ്പോർട്ടു ചെയ്യുന്ന പതിവുണ്ടോ?

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I know whether any remedy has been provided for in the rules if there be any delay beyond the limits fixed by the rules?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): If there is any delay, complaint has only to be made to me or to the Divisional Forest Officers.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Am I to understand that there is no provision in the rules for redressing the grievances of the people if any delay is caused in the issue of passes?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): There is provision that in such cases an endorsement should be given to the party stating why it was delayed.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): Is the Conservator quite positive that there are such rules in British India or Malabar, for example?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): There are transport rules there.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): Will the Conservator kindly hand over a copy of such rules to me?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): Yes; but not now.

MR. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Neduvangad*): Will the Conservator read out to the House any such rules relevant to this question?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): There are transport rules for each District in Madras.

MR. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Neduvangad*): Will he kindly read out one of those rules, directly relevant to the present discussion?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): Unfortunately I have not got the rules with me now.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): What happened to the report of the committee referred to by Mr. Kunjitomman?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): It was submitted to Government with the dissenting notes. The Government went through the whole thing, consolidated it and issued it in the form of rules which were published in the Gazette afterwards. Those rules are in working now.

MR. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Neduvangad*): Was the report itself made public?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): There was a reference by me with regard to this point last time in the Council and the President gave a ruling on the matter that the report of a committee appointed by the Council need not be placed before the Council.

MR. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Neduvangad*): The question was whether it was, as a matter of fact, made public. The answer could have been simpler.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): കമ്മിറ്റി റിപ്പോർട്ടിന്റെ ഭിന്നഭിപ്രായം കൗൺസിലിന്റെ അറിവിനായിട്ട് വെളിപ്പെടുത്തരുതേ?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): എനിക്കു വിരോധമില്ല. ഗവണ്മെന്റ് അതിന്മേൽ ഉത്തരവു പുറപ്പെടുവിച്ചു കഴിഞ്ഞു. അതുകൊണ്ടു ഗവണ്മെന്റിനോടു ചോതിക്കേണ്ടതാണ്.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): അതിപ്പോൾ കൺസർവേറ്ററുടെ കൈവശം ഉണ്ടോ?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): ഇല്ല.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): അതു വരുത്തി വായിക്കാമോ?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): അതു ഗവണ്മെന്റിൽ സമർപ്പിച്ചുപോയി. അതിനെപ്പറ്റി പ്രൈവറായിട്ട് വന്നു ചോദിച്ചാൽ പറയാം.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ആളായിട്ടാണോ കൺസർവേറ്റർ ഇപ്പോൾ സമരം സാരിക്കുന്നത്?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): അതേ.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ അനവാദത്തോടുകൂടിയാണോ?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): അതേ.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ഈ കാര്യത്തിന് മറുപടി പറയാൻ ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ പ്രത്യേകാനവാദം വേണോ?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): വേണ്ട.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ഓരോ ചോദ്യത്തിന് ഉത്തരം പറയാൻ അനുവാദം കിട്ടിട്ടുണ്ടോ ഇല്ലയോ എന്നു മനസ്സിലാക്കിട്ടു ഞങ്ങൾ ചോദ്യംചോതിക്കേണ്ടിയിരിക്കുന്നുവല്ലോ. അനുവാദം ഉണ്ടായാൽ മറുപടി പറയാമോ?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): പറയാം.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): Sir, I wish to say a few words about this resolution. I may say I oppose it. This resolution seems to be a very familiar friend of ours. Although my friend the Conservator does not refer to it, I see we discussed it as a resolution about a year ago; and but for the fact that the same resolution could not be brought up a second time within the same year, probably, this resolution might have been brought up earlier. We find in pages 910 to 960 of Volume VIII of the Travancore Legislative Council Proceedings the very same resolution discussed. The discussion goes up to 50 pages in print. As I was listening to my friend Mr. Kunjitomman just a while ago, I found that he was advancing the very same arguments that he advanced on the last occasion. There was not a single fresh point to support the resolution. And the very same scene was enacted by the Conservator of Forests on the other side. He also stated the very same arguments, against the resolution, that he advanced on the last occasion. (Mr. M. Sivatanu Pillai: *Hear, hear.*) We heard the same arguments in support of the resolution and the same arguments against it. (*Laughter.*) The very same scene is being enacted again, and we are detained in the consideration of this resolution.

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): May I know whether he opposed the resolution on the last occasion also?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): I said at the outset that I oppose it.

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): My question was whether he opposed it on the last occasion also?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): Then also I opposed it.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): പ്രീ പാസ്സ് വിഷയമായി സങ്കടം അനുഭവിക്കുന്ന രാജ്യങ്ങളിലെ ഉൾഭാഗങ്ങളിൽ സഞ്ചരിച്ച ജനങ്ങളുടെ കഷ്ടത മനസ്സിലാക്കിയിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): ഉണ്ട്.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ഉൾനാടുകളിൽ സഞ്ചരിച്ച മനസ്സിലാക്കിയിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): എന്റെ സ്ഥലത്തുനിന്നും മലക്കു വു ഫാർലാങ്ങ് ദൂരമേയുള്ളൂ.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ എല്ലാഭാഗങ്ങളിലും സഞ്ചരിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): ഏകദേശം ഞാൻ കണ്ടിട്ടാണ് പറയുന്നത്.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): എല്ലാഭാഗവും കണ്ടിട്ടു ഇതിനെ അനുക്രമിക്കുന്നതിനോ പ്രതികൂലിക്കുന്നതിനോ പറച്ചെടുകയല്ലേ നല്ലത്?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): അങ്ങിനെ എല്ലാഭാഗവും നോക്കേണ്ട ആവശ്യമില്ല.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ഞങ്ങളുടെ ഡിപ്യൂട്ടി പ്രസിഡണ്ടു ഇങ്ങനെ ഗൗരവമുള്ള സംഗതികളിൽ നല്ലവണ്ണം നോക്കിവേണ്ട ഒരഭിപ്രായം പറയാൻ?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): ഈ സംഗതി അത്ര ഗൗരവമുള്ളതാണോ എന്നാണ് എന്റെ സംശയം.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): അനുമാനത്തേക്കാൾ അനുഭവമല്ലേ പ്രമാണം?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): അങ്ങിനെ ആണെങ്കിൽ പ്രമാണം അനേകമുണ്ട്.

I think, Sir, we may go on arguing like that. But my point is this. Not that I do not sympathise with Mr. Kunjittomman. The question is more or less one of principle. I do not say that the Council is in the least debarred from considering the same subject over and over again. But we will not be justified in doing it unless the question is of sufficient importance. There is no harm in discussing the same question over and over again if any new material is brought in for discussion. Now what is stated by Mr. Kunjittomman is that ever since the constitution of the Assembly this question was agitated; and the Conservator's reply is that in pursuance of that agitation a committee was appointed, that the committee submitted its report and draft rules (approved by the majority of the committee), that the Government accepted the rules which were published in the Gazette and that the rules have been in force since January 1924.....

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): മല അധികമുള്ള വടക്കൻ തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലുള്ള കമ്മിററി മെമ്പർമാർ രണ്ടുപേരും ഭിന്നാഭിപ്രായം രേഖപ്പെടുത്തിട്ടുള്ളതായി അറിയാമോ?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): അതു കൃത്യം എന്ന് കൗൺസിൽ പ്രൊസിഡിംഗ്സുകൊണ്ടു കാണുന്നുണ്ട്.

I know all that. The fact that two members dissented, and all the rest of it is seen from the Proceedings of this Council when it discussed the same question on the last occasion. I read all this from the Proceedings this morning ; because when I saw this resolution in today's agenda paper it seemed familiar to me and I looked at the back volumes and found that the same subject had been discussed completely about a year ago.

My friend Mr. Kunjitomman and those with him may say that we should be at liberty to do whatever we like so far as our property is concerned. But the general principle is that the Government should impose certain limitations on individual liberties with a view to safeguard higher and more important public interests. It is, I believe in view of that principle that the Forest Regulation has been enacted and rules have been framed thereunder. It may be that we should be at liberty to do anything that we like. But the question is that there are about 2,400 sq. miles of forests in Travancore ; and so it is very difficult to prevent smuggling from these forests. That being the case I ask whether it is not necessary that there must be some restriction put upon the transport of timber whether it be from private holdings or from Government forests. The Conservator has been telling us that in areas where there is not much of forests there is absolutely no restriction put upon the transport of timber and that it is only in areas near forests that restrictions have been imposed. I think the Government is perfectly justified in so doing.

The Conservator has been just now pointing out to us that he has not heard any complaints from anybody in regard to the hardship caused by the working of the present rules ; and I believe Mr. Kunjitomman knows it. The new rules were passed only in January 1924. It is only 4 years now since then ; and Mr. Dhanukoti Pillai has given us figures to show.....

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): മറുരാജ്യങ്ങളിൽ ഏതെങ്കിലും ഭാഗത്തു പാസ്സുവേണമെന്നു വെച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): എന്നാണു മിസ്റ്റർ ധനുക്കോടിപ്പിള്ള പറയുന്നത്. Anyhow there has been considerable relaxation in the matter. My point is this. Mr. Kunjitomman is very keen about this matter. If there has been even the slightest delay or the slightest inconvenience caused to the people, I beg to say that he would have been the very first to bring it to the notice of the authorities so that the delinquents, if any, might have been punished. No complaint seems to have been made. On the

[Mr. V. Subba Aiyar].

other hand the Conservator assures us that out of 1,083 applications, except 5 or 6, all the rest were issued within time. That being the case I do not know whether there is any ground for us to reconsider the whole question and to discuss it in the same way in which we discussed it on the last occasion. As I already stated the last discussion is in the eighth volume and so it is clear that we discussed it only in 1926. So, what I say is that, unless any new circumstance has been brought out and unless it is stated '*We find such and such difficulties such and such inconveniences on account of the working of the present rules. The officers of the Forest Department still continue to molest us.*' I say we will not be justified in wasting our time in considering this question. Nothing has been said about the rules of 1924 January. The same old arguments have been trotted out again today. After having discussed the question threadbare on the last occasion, after having spent four or five hours of our time in considering the whole question once, I ask, are we justified.....

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I know from the member whether he did not say on the last occasion that if the issue of the pass is delayed beyond the fixed period the applicant should be enabled to remove the timber of his own accord?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): I did not say that in my speech. I interpellated Mr. Dhanukoti Pillai when he was speaking. If I remember right that was my question to Mr. Dhanukoti Pillai.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I know from the member when he resolved to oppose the motion—whether before he looked into the Proceedings or afterwards.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): I do not exactly remember, when that crossed my mind. It struck me this morning that we had something to do with this resolution very recently and I went through the whole report of the Proceedings. I wanted to know whether Mr. Kunjitomman had any new grounds to advance about the working of the new rules. If he had any we should be inclined by all means to hear him. Without advancing any further reasons and without knowing the inconveniences under which the people suffer under the existing rules, I do not know why we should reconsider the question.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): Did not Mr. Kunjitomman say that there was considerable delay in the issue of free passes even after the passing of the new rules?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): I am not prepared to accept the statement of Mr. Kunjitomman in preference to Mr. Dhanukoti Pillai. Mr. Dhanukoti Pillai has stated that there was delay in the case of only six applications out of one thousand eighty three applications. If there was any delay that may be brought to the notice of the Conservator or of the Government.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Does not the member think that there should be a remedial provision in the rules in favour of the applicant if there was a delay exceeding a fortnight in disposing of the application?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): I do not think there should be any remedial provision in the rules in regard to that. When the Conservator is informed that his subordinates are not obeying the rules he will be the very first person to punish them. I believe that itself is a sufficient deterrent.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Would it not be better to have an enabling provision for the applicant to seek some other remedy?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): I do not think there is any need for such an enabling provision. There is the Divisional Forest Officer, the Conservator and the Government. The applicant may petition these authorities. It should not be understood that I am speaking on behalf of Government. I do not hold a brief for the Government. There are officers paid by Government to speak for them. My point is that we need not spend much of our time in discussing this question unless there is any new matter.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Is not the very fact, that Mr. Kunjitomman thought it fit to press the matter over again in this Council, a sufficient reason for us to discuss this question?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): No.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Does not the member think that there is something rotten somewhere?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): That depends upon the mentality of the individual.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): I beg to support the resolution brought forward by Mr. Kunjitomman. The main object of my speech now is to consider the points raised by Mr. Subba Aiyar. Mr. Subba Aiyar pointed out to us that unless there were some new points to be considered it was not proper for us to spend much time over this resolution. I beg to submit that new points have arisen in the course of these two years and Mr. Kunjitomman has referred to them. In spite of the rules passed and in spite of the changes made, Mr. Kunjitomman pointed out that the people are still suffering. Mr. Subba Aiyar observed that if there are cases of such kind they should have been brought forward by Mr. Kunjitomman. I beg to ask whether a private individual like Mr. Kunjitomman will be in a position to spend much of his time in gathering information about cases of management and malpractice on the part of the subordinate officials of the Forest Department. The very reason for his having brought this resolution before this Council now is that there may be an opportunity given for other members to speak upon the subject and of their own experiences in the matter. I consider therefore that it is quite proper that the resolution was brought forward again and that there is sufficient ground for considering it anew. I admit that the general considerations have been threshed out before. But the fact that

[Mr. G. Raman Menon].

even after the new rules have been framed conditions continue nearly the same as before deserves to be seriously considered by this House. Departmental figures may show that there have not been delays in the disposal of applications but the experience of the people are to be relied upon by this part of the House. My own information is that things are nearly as bad as before. It was pointed out that in areas which are far away from the reserved forests there is absolutely no restriction to remove bamboos. I wish to know what is the distance fixed. I think if a definite rule is laid down to the effect that beyond a distance of about 10 miles from the reserved forests there will be no restrictions at all it will be somewhat reasonable. Provision has been made that the passes should be issued within a fixed time. It is not sufficient. It does not safeguard the interests of the people. The people should be given liberty to transport the timber without passes if they are not issued within the time fixed. I doubt whether any such provision has been made. My information is that there is no such provision. If the authorities fail to issue the passes without proper reasons there should be conveniences afforded to the people for the transport of timber. I have heard that in the case of applications for the building of churches if the application is not disposed of within 90 days the party is quite free to put up the church. In the same way, if the passes are not issued within the time fixed by the Government then the party should be free to transport timber without the passes. All these are new points, brought forward by Mr. Kunjitomman. Mr. Kunjitomman said that though the rule provides that passes should be issued within a fixed time the rule has not been adhered to. I believe therefore that an additional provision should be made that if the pass is not issued within the time fixed, the party should be free to transport timber without a pass.

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): ഒരു കൊല്ലത്തിനുമുമ്പു മിസ്റ്റർ കഞ്ഞിത്തൊമ്മൻ ഈ മാതിരിയുള്ള ഒരു പ്രമേയം ഇവിടെ ഹാജരാക്കിയ അവസരത്തിൽ ഞാൻ ആ പ്രമേയത്തെ എത്രക്കുകയാണ് ചെയ്തിരുന്നത്. എന്നാൽ ഒരു കൊല്ലത്തിനുശേഷം പിന്നീടുള്ള എന്റെ അറിയും അനുഭവവുമൊക്കെ ഇപ്പോഴും ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ എത്രക്കേണ്ടിതന്നെ ചെന്നിരിക്കുന്നു. തിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ ഉള്ള വനത്തിൽ പേരിൽപതിവുഭൂമികൾ മൂന്നിനുമായി തിരിക്കാവുന്നതാണ്. ഒന്നാമതു റിസർവ്വേഷനുള്ളിൽതന്നെ നാലുവശവും റിസർവ്വേഷൻ പേരിൽപതിവു ഭൂമികളും ഉണ്ട്. പേരിൽപതിവുഭൂമികൾക്കു മൂന്നു വശവും റിസർവ്വേഷനുള്ളിൽ ഉണ്ട്. ഒരുവശവും റിസർവ്വേഷൻ ഇല്ലാത്ത സ്ഥലങ്ങൾ വളരെ കുറവാണ്. ഈ നിലയിലാണ് തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ സ്ഥിതി.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): അമ്പലപ്പുഴ വൈയ്ക്കം മുതലായ സ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽ പാസ്സിന്റെ ആവശ്യമുണ്ടോ?

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (Pattanamtitta) : ആഞ്ഞിലി പ്ലാവ് മുതലായ വൃക്ഷങ്ങൾ കടത്തിക്കൊണ്ടുപോകുന്നതിന് യാതൊരു പാസ്സും വേണ്ട. മുളക്കു പാസ്സുവേണം. അതും വ്യാപാരികൾ വണ്ടിയിൽ കയറ്റിക്കൊണ്ടു പോകുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു അതിനുമത്രമെ പാസ്സുവേണമെന്നു നിർബന്ധമുള്ളു.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha) : വ്യാപാരികൾക്കുമാത്രമെ മുള കൊണ്ടുപോകേണ്ട ആവശ്യമുള്ളോ?

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (Pattanamtitta) : മറ്റുള്ളവർക്കു തലച്ചുമടായിക്കൊണ്ടുപോകാൻ പാസ്സുവേണ്ട. റോഡിൽകൂടെ വണ്ടിയിൽ കൊണ്ടുപോകുന്നെങ്കിൽ മാത്രമെ പാസ്സു ആവശ്യമുള്ളു.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha) : ജലമാറ്റമായും കരമാറ്റമായും കൊണ്ടുപോകുന്നതിനു പാസ്സുവേണമെന്നു മെമ്പർക്കു അറിയാമോ?

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (Pattanamtitta) : തലച്ചുമടിനു വേണ്ടെന്നു അറിയാം.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha) : അമ്പലപ്പുഴ ചേർത്തല മുതലായ സ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽനിന്നും തലച്ചുമടായി കൊണ്ടുപോകുന്നതു വളരെ പ്രയാസമാണെന്നു അറിയാമോ?

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (Pattanamtitta) : അമ്പലപ്പുഴ ചേർത്തല ഈ സ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽ മുള ഉണ്ടോ എന്നുതന്നെ സംശയമാണ്. അമ്പലപ്പുഴ മുളയില്ല.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha) : ചേർത്തല മുളയുണ്ടോ?

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (Pattanamtitta) : അതു ചേർത്തല മെമ്പർ മി: ശിവരാമപണിക്കർ പറയണം.

MR. K. SIVARAMA PANIKKAR (Shertallai) : സാധാരണയായിട്ടില്ല.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha) : അസാധാരണമായിട്ടെങ്കിലും ഉണ്ടെല്ലോ?

MR. K. SIVARAMA PANIKKAR (Shertallai) : ഇല്ല, തീരെ ഇല്ല.

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (Pattanamtitta) : മലകളിൽനിന്നും തേമ്പാവ്, മരുതു്, വേങ്ങ മുതലായ വൃക്ഷങ്ങൾ കടത്തിക്കൊണ്ടു പോകാനാണ് പ്രീപാസ്സു ആവശ്യമുള്ളതു്. സ്വന്ത പേരിൽ ഉള്ള പതിവു ഭൂമികളിൽനിന്നും വൃക്ഷങ്ങൾ അധികം മുറിക്കാതിരിക്കുന്നതിനാണ് ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ പ്രീപാസ്സ് ഉപയോഗപ്പെടുത്തുന്നതു്.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): അടുത്ത പുരയിടങ്ങളിൽ കൊണ്ടുപോകാൻ തടസ്സം ഇല്ലെ?

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*). ഉരുപ്പടി ആക്കി കൊണ്ടുപോകുന്നതിനു തടസ്സം ഇല്ലാ എന്നാണ് എന്റെ അറിവ്.

തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലുള്ള റിസർവ്വ് പേരിൽപതിവു സ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽ നിന്നു വേർതിരിക്കാൻ തെക്കെ അറ്റം മുതൽ വടക്കെ അറ്റം വരെ ഒരു റോഡ് ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നാൽ നന്നായിരിക്കും. ഇപ്പോൾ പത്തൊ അൻപതൊ തടികളെ റിസർവ്വിൽനിന്നും മുറിച്ചു പേരിൽപതിവു പുരയിടത്തിലേക്കു കടത്തിക്കൊണ്ടുപോകാൻ യാതൊരു പ്രയാസവുമില്ല.

MR. KURANDIPALLIL R. RAMAN PILLAI (*Quilon*): അതു സൂക്ഷിക്കുന്നതിനു സഞ്ചായം ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റുകാർ ഇല്ലെ?

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): അതിലേക്കു ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരുണ്ടെങ്കിലും എല്ലാം കണ്ടുപിടിക്കാൻ സാധിക്കുകയില്ല.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ഓരോ ഭവനത്തിലും ഉള്ള പണപ്പെട്ടിയുടെ അടുത്തു പോലീസുകാർ ഇല്ലാതിരുന്നിട്ടും മോഷണം നടക്കുന്നില്ലല്ലോ.

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): അത് ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാർ ശ്രദ്ധയായി സൂക്ഷിക്കുന്നതു കൊണ്ടാണു്.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): മറ്റു എല്ലായിടത്തു നിന്നും സാധാരണ മോഷ്ടിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു പോകുമ്പോൾ കേസ് ഉണ്ടാകുന്നില്ലല്ലോ.

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): അതിനു തക്കവണ്ണം ആളില്ലാത്തതു കൊണ്ടാണു്.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ഗവണ്മെന്റിൽ നിന്നും എല്ലാം സൂക്ഷിക്കുന്നതിനു ആളുകൾ ഉണ്ടെന്നല്ലെ പറഞ്ഞത്.?

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): റിസർവ്വിൽ നിന്നും തടി കടത്തിക്കൊണ്ടു പോകുന്നതിനു ഈ സിസ്റ്റം ഇല്ലാത്തതാൽ കൂടുതൽ സൗകര്യം ഉണ്ടാകുന്നതാണു്. എന്നാൽ ഉരുപ്പടി ആക്കിക്കൊണ്ടു പോകുകയാണെങ്കിൽ അതിനു തടസ്സവും ഇല്ല. പ്രിപാസ്സ് കൊടുക്കുന്നതിനു റൊയ്ലിയുടെ ഉടമസ്ഥാവകാശം നിണ്ണയിക്കുന്നതിനു പാർലമെന്റുകാരുടെ സർട്ടിഫിക്കറ്റു വരണമെന്നുണ്ടു്.

MR. C. P. TARAKAN (*Kunnathnad*) ഇപ്പോൾ വനങ്ങളിൽ നിന്നും തടികടത്തിക്കൊണ്ടു പോകുന്നത് പലപ്പോഴും ഫാറസ്സ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റിലെ ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരുടെ അറിവോടുകൂടിയാണെന്നറിയാമോ?

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): അതു എങ്ങിനെയാണെന്നു വനത്തിൽ നിന്നും റിസർവ്വ് ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരുടെ സഹായത്തോടുകൂടിയും ഇല്ലാതെയും തടി കൊണ്ടു പോകുന്നതിനു ആലോചിച്ചു പരിചയമുള്ളവർക്കു മാത്രമേ അറിയാവൂ.

എനിക്കു തന്നെ ഇതുമാതിരി പുതുവൽ സ്ഥലങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ട്. എന്റെ അറിവിലും അനുഭവത്തിലും ഉള്ള സംഗതികളാണ് ഞാൻ പറയുന്നതു. എനിക്കു തന്നെ വേണമെങ്കിൽ റിസർവ്വിൽ നിന്നും തടി വെട്ടി എന്റെ പുരയിടത്തിൽ ഇറക്കാൻ സാധിക്കും. ഫാറസ്സ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റുകാർക്കു കണ്ടുപിടിക്കാനും സാധിക്കയില്ല. ഇതെല്ലാം എനിക്കു അനുഭവമുള്ളതാണ്. പ്രീപാസ്സ് സിസ്റ്റം നിർത്തികളഞ്ഞാൽ തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ഭാവി പൌരന്മാരുടെ ആവശ്യത്തിനു ഉപകരിക്കാത്ത നിലയിൽ റിസർവിലുള്ള തടിമുഴുവനും നാമാവശേഷമായി പോകും. ഇപ്പോൾ ഒരു മാസത്തിനകംകൊണ്ടു പോകത്തക്കവിധത്തിൽ പാസ്സ് കിട്ടുന്നുണ്ട്. പ്രീപാസ്സിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ച നൂതനമായ രൂപം നാലു കൊല്ലത്തിനിപ്പറമായത്രാണു ഉണ്ടായിട്ടുള്ളതു്. അതിനു മുമ്പു പ്രീ പാസ്സ് കിട്ടണമെന്നു മുറവിളി കൂട്ടിക്കൊണ്ടിരുന്നു. എന്റെ നിയോജകമണ്ഡലത്തിലുൾപ്പെട്ട റാന്നി പകുതിയിൽ തന്നെ —

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ രൂപം വന്നതിനുശേഷം പ്രീ പാസ്സ് വാങ്ങി മെമ്പർ തടികൊണ്ടു പോയിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): ഉണ്ട്. കഴിഞ്ഞ കൊല്ലത്തിൽ കൊണ്ടുപോയിട്ടുണ്ട്. പാസ്സുകിട്ടാൻ ഒരു മാസത്തിൽ കൂടുതൽ താമസിച്ചിട്ടില്ല.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapall*): അതു പോലെ സാധുക്കൾക്കു സാധിക്കുമോ?

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): സാധു എന്നും ധനവാൻ എന്നും ഉള്ള വ്യത്യാസം ഗവണ്മെന്റിനില്ല. രണ്ടുപേരേയും ഒരു പോലെയാണ് വിചാരിക്കുന്നത്. എന്റെ നിയോജകമണ്ഡലം റിസർവിനോടു ചേർന്നതാണ്. പ്രീ പാസ്സ് ലഭിക്കുന്നതിനു് ഒരു മാസത്തിൽകൂടുതൽ കാലതാമസം നേരിട്ടിട്ടുള്ളതായി എനിക്കറിവില്ല.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): സ്വന്തപുരയിടത്തിലുള്ള തടിയെ ഉപയോഗിക്കുന്നതിനു ഒരു മാസത്തെ താമസം വിധിക്കുന്ന സിസ്റ്റം അസൗകര്യമല്ലേ? സ്വന്തഭവനത്തിലുള്ള സാധനങ്ങളെ ഉപയോഗിക്കാമെന്നു ഒരു ഏർപ്പാടു ഉണ്ടെങ്കിൽ ഒരു മാസം താമസം വരികയില്ലല്ലോ.

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): സ്വന്തം തടികളെ ഉപയോഗിക്കുന്നതിനു മറ്റൊരാളിന്റെ അനുവാദം വേണ്ടിവരുന്നില്ല എന്നുള്ള ഭാഗത്തോടു ഞാനും യോജിക്കുന്നു.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): അതിനും ഒരു മാസത്തെ താമസം കൂടി വേണമെന്നു വരുന്നതു അതിലും കഷ്ടമല്ലേ? രെടിയന്തിരത്തിനു നെടുമ്പുറ പെട്ടെന്നു കെട്ടുന്നതിനു നിവൃത്തിയില്ലല്ലോ.

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): നെടുമ്പുറ കെട്ടുന്നതിനു ചേരിക്കൽ ഭൂമികളിൽ നിന്നും മുള കൊണ്ടു വന്നു മാത്രമേ കെട്ടാവൂ എന്നു ആരും വിചാരിക്കാറില്ല.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ഇപ്പോൾ റിസർവ്വിൽ നിന്നല്ലാതെ മറ്റു സ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽ നിന്നും കൊണ്ടു പോകണമെങ്കിലും പാസ്സു വേണമെന്നു വരുന്നില്ലേ?

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): തലച്ചുമടായി കൊണ്ടു പോകാമല്ലോ.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): അധികം കൊണ്ടു പോകണമെങ്കിൽ സാധിക്കയില്ലല്ലോ. അതുകൊണ്ടു ഈ അസ്വാതന്ത്ര്യം ഇരുന്നുകൊള്ളട്ടെ എന്നാണോ പറയുന്നതു.

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): അധികമായി കൊണ്ടു പോകണമെന്നുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ പത്തു ചുമടായി കൊണ്ടു പോകാമല്ലോ.

ഈ സിസ്റ്റം നിർമ്മൽ ചെയ്താൽ രാജ്യത്തിനു വളരെ ഹാനികരമാണെന്നാണ് എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം. അതിനാൽ ഞാൻ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ എതിർക്കുന്നു.

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): I really wonder why the Conservator of Forests should be so very anxious to oppose this resolution. As a matter of fact, if the system of Free Passes is done away with, much of his work will be lightened. He is taking care of our forests.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Does the member look at the resolution from the point of view of business?

MR. S. PIRÁVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): From very many points. We are paying taxes to the Government to protect us, to work for us and to get more conveniences from them. By the Free Pass Rules system the Conservator is looking after our estates. But for this system any man may rob us of our timber. If this system is in vogue we need not have our own guards and watch pillais.

MR. KURANDIPALLIL R. RAMAN PILLAI (*Quilon*): Is the member opposing or supporting the resolution?

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): If the member will patiently wait he will know.

I think the Conservator's view in opposing this resolution is only to safeguard our interests. If the free pass rules are done away with persons like Mr. Kunjitomman would have the forests to look after so that they may not be robbed away of their trees. I do not think that the cancellation of the system will in any way be beneficial to us. I therefore oppose this resolution.

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): മി: കണ്ടതിത്തൊമ്മൻ അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ പ്രസംഗത്തിൽ പറഞ്ഞതുപോലെ പ്രീ പാസ്സ് സിസ്റ്റം നിർത്തണമെന്ന ഞാൻ പലരവസരങ്ങളിലും ശ്രീമൂലം പ്രജാസഭയിൽ പ്രസ്താവിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): അത് ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ കൺസർവേറർ ഈസ്ഥാനത്തു വരുന്നതിനു മുമ്പേ?

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): അതിനുള്ള കാരണം ആകാലത്തു പ്രീ പാസ്സിനപേക്ഷിച്ചാൽ ൩-ാം ൪-ാം സംവത്സരങ്ങൾ താമസിച്ച് പാസ്സുകിട്ടുകയൊള്ള. അതിന്നു പുറമേ തടിമുറിച്ചു ഇട്ടിട്ടുള്ളത് ആ കെട്ടിടത്തിനുപയോഗിക്കാൻ സാധിക്കാതെ വന്നിട്ടുള്ളതിനു പല ദുഷ്ഘാതങ്ങളും ഉണ്ട്. ഈ സംഗതികളെപ്പറ്റി ഗൗരവമായിട്ട് ആലോചിച്ചതിന്റെ ഫലമായിട്ടു പല സൗകര്യങ്ങളും ചെയ്തുകൊടുത്തു. മി: കണ്ടതിത്തൊമ്മൻ പറഞ്ഞതിൽ പ്രധാനമായ സംഗതി പേരിൽ പതിവു ഭൂമികളിൽ ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാർക്കുണ്ടായിരിക്കേണ്ടതായ അവകാശത്തിനു ഇതൊരു പ്രതിബന്ധമായിത്തീരുന്നു എന്നുള്ളതാണ്. അതിനെ ആക്കും പ്രതിഷേധിക്കാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല. ജന്മാവകാശം സിദ്ധിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതായ വസ്തുവിലുള്ള വൃക്ഷങ്ങളെ ഉടമസ്ഥനു സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യമായി ഉപയോഗിക്കാൻ പാടില്ലെന്നുള്ള ഒരു ന്യൂനത ഇതിലുണ്ട്. മറ്റൊരു സംഗതി ഇവിടെ ആലോചിക്കേണ്ടതു ഈ പ്രീ പാസ്സ് എന്നതിനു വച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു എന്നുള്ളതിനെപ്പറ്റിയാണ്. പൊതു ജനങ്ങളുടേയും അവരുടെ

[Mr. T. Kumara Pillai.]

ടെ പരമ്പരാവകാശത്തിന്റേയും ഗുണത്തെ ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചാണ് ഇതു എടുപ്പു
ടുത്തിട്ടുള്ളത്. ഈ രണ്ടു സംഗതികളേയും തുല്യബലത്തോടുകൂടി നോ
ക്കി അതിനു ഒരു പരിഹാരം ഉണ്ടാക്കേണ്ടിയിരിക്കുന്നു.

ഞാൻ മുമ്പു ഈ കൌൺസിൽ അഭിപ്രായപ്പെട്ടതുപോലെ ഫാ
റസ്റ്റ് ഗാർഡുകൾക്കു സ്റ്റേഷൻ റിസർവ്വുത്തിയോടു ചേർത്ത സ്ഥാപിക്ക
ണം. റിസർവ്വ് വനത്തെ തൊട്ടുകിടക്കുന്ന ഭൂമികളിൽ നിന്നും ആ തരം
തടിമാറണമെങ്കിൽ പ്രീപാസ്സു വേണമെന്നുവരും അതിനിപ്പറമുള്ള
സ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽ പ്രീപാസ്സു വേണ്ടെന്നുവരും ചെയ്യണം. മി: കഞ്ഞിത്തൊ
മ്മൻ മി: നാരായണപിള്ളയോടു ഒരു ചോദ്യം ചോദിച്ചു. അതായത്
അമ്പലപ്പുഴ, തിരുവല്ല മുതലായ സ്ഥലങ്ങളിലും പാസ്സു വേണോ എന്നാ
ണ്. സമുദ്രതീരങ്ങളിൽ വസിക്കുന്നവർക്കും ഈ തരത്തിൽ സങ്കടം അ
നുഭവിക്കേണ്ടിവരുന്നത് നല്ലതല്ല. എന്നായിരുന്നാലും ഈ പ്രീപാസ്സി
നെ നിശ്ശേഷം നിർത്തിക്കളയുന്നത് ഒരിക്കലും നന്നായിരിക്കയില്ലെന്നാ
ണ് എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം. ജനങ്ങൾക്കും അവരുടെ സന്താനങ്ങൾക്കും
സങ്കടമില്ലാത്തവിധത്തിൽ വനം ഉപയോഗിക്കണമെങ്കിൽ വനം ഡി
പ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റിൽ നിന്നും കാവൽസ്ഥലങ്ങളെ റിസർവ്വ് വനങ്ങളോടു ചേർത്തു
സ്ഥാപിക്കയും, റിസർവ്വ് നോട്ടു തോട്ടസ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽ നിന്നും തടികൊണ്ടുവ
രുന്നതിനു പ്രീപാസ്സുവേണമെന്നുവരും ബാക്കിയുള്ള പേരിൽ പതിവു
ഭൂമികൾക്കു പ്രീപാസ്സു വേണ്ടെന്നുവരും ചെയ്യണം. പ്രീപാസ്സു കമ്മ
റിയുടെ റിപ്പോർട്ട് ഗവർണ്മെന്റിലേക്കു സമർപ്പിക്കയും അതിന്റെ ഫലമാ
യി ചിലർക്കു നടപ്പിൽ വരുത്തുകയും ചെയ്യൂ. അതിൽ പിന്നീടും ഈ
സിസ്റ്റം ജനങ്ങൾക്കു ഉപദ്രവകരമായിരിക്കുന്നു എന്നുള്ളതിനു ദൃഷ്ടാന്തങ്ങ
ളൊന്നും മി: കഞ്ഞിത്തൊമ്മൻ പറഞ്ഞുകാണുന്നില്ല.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*):
ജനങ്ങൾക്കു ഇപ്പോഴും ആ വിഷയത്തിൽ സങ്കടമുണ്ടെന്നു ഞാൻ പറ
ഞ്ഞില്ലേ?

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): ഈ നിയമ
ത്തിൽ ജനങ്ങൾക്കു പൊതുവെ സങ്കടമുണ്ടെന്നു പറയുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് അ
ദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ വാദത്തിനു പൂർണ്ണമായ ശക്തിയുണ്ടെന്നു ഞാൻ വിചാരിക്ക
ുന്നില്ല. അങ്ങിനെ സങ്കടമുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ സാധുജനങ്ങളുടെ നേതാവായത്ത്
ആക്കെല്ലാം സങ്കടമുണ്ടെന്നു ഒരു പട്ടികതയ്യാറാക്കി മി: കഞ്ഞിത്തൊമ്മ
ൻ ഗവർണ്മെന്റിനെ മനസ്സിലാക്കാമായിരുന്നു.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): അങ്ങിനെയുള്ള ആളുകളുടെ പേരുവേണമെങ്കിൽ പറയാം.

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): അങ്ങിനെ ചെയ്തിരുന്നവെങ്കിൽ അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ അഭിപ്രായത്തോടു പുണ്ണമായി യോജിക്കുന്നതിനു ഞാൻ തന്നെ സന്നദ്ധനാകുമായിരുന്നു. എന്റെ കാൺ സ്റ്റിറവ്വൻസിയിലും അതിനടുത്ത പ്രദേശങ്ങളിലും എന്റെ അറിവിൽ പെട്ടിടത്തോളം പ്രീപാസ്സിനു സങ്കടകാരജ്ജ്വലമായിട്ടു കാണുന്നില്ല. അതിനുള്ള കാരണം ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ റൂൾസനുസരിച്ചു പ്രീപാസ്സിനു കാലതാമസമോ, ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റുകാരുടെ ഉപദ്രവമോ ഉണ്ടാകുന്നപക്ഷം പ്രീപാസ്സിനു നിശ്ചയമായും ദോഷം വരുമെന്നു സകല ആളുകൾക്കും അറിയാം. അതിനാൽ കൺസർവേറർ തന്റെ കീഴ്ഭോഗസ്ഥന്മാർ നിമിത്തം പരാതി ഉണ്ടാകാതെ ഇരിക്കാൻ വേണ്ട ജാഗ്രതകൾ ചെയ്യുന്നു എന്നാണ് ഞാൻ വിചാരിക്കുന്നത്. ജനങ്ങൾക്കുവേണ്ടി എന്തിരിക്കുന്നു; ഗവർണ്മെന്റു ജനങ്ങൾക്കായു മിരിക്കുന്നു. അതുകൊണ്ടു ജനങ്ങളുടെയും ഗവർണ്മെന്റിന്റെയും ക്ഷേമത്തിനു നിയമത്തെ സംരക്ഷിക്കണം.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*) : May I know whether if on the applicant failing to get the free pass within the period prescribed, he should not remove timber at all.

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*) : ഒരാൾ പാസ്സിനു അപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നു. റൂൾസിനെ വ്യവസ്ഥപ്രകാരം ചെയ്തുകഴിഞ്ഞാൽ പിന്നീടു തടി കൊണ്ടുവരാമോ എന്നാണ് അദ്ദേഹം ചോദിക്കുന്നത്. അതിനുദ്യോജ്ഞപ്രകാരം മറുപടി പറയേണ്ടിയിരിക്കുന്നു. ഒരു പുരയിടത്തിന്റെ പന്ത്രണ്ടിൽ ഒരുഭാഗം മാത്രം അവകാശമുള്ള ഒരാൾക്ക് അതിൽ നിന്നും കടർ തടിമുറിക്കുന്നതിന് ഫാറസ്റ്റ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റിനോടു പാസ്സിനുപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നു. അയാൾ ശരിയായ അവകാശിയാണോ എന്നു ലാൻററവന്യൂ ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റിൽ എഴുതിചോദിച്ചതിനു ശേഷമല്ലാതെ അയാൾക്കു പാസ്സുകൊടുക്കാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല.

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*) : May I know whether a Succession Certificate should be obtained?

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): അതല്ല. വസ്തു ഇന്നാരുടെ വകയാണെന്നു നിശ്ചയിക്കേണ്ടതു് റവന്യൂ ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റുകാരുടെജോലിയാണ്.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): അവകാശം നിണ്ണിച്ചതിനു ശേഷമേ പാസ്സുകൊടുക്കാവൂ എന്നാണോ പറയുന്നത്?

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): ഈ രൂപം ഏതെന്നാൽ ഞാൻ കൂടി ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നു. അതിനെ നല്ലപോലെ മനസ്സിലാക്കിട്ടാണ് ഞാൻ സംസാരിക്കുന്നത്. അതുകൊണ്ട് കൂടുതൽ ചോദിക്കേണ്ട ആവശ്യമില്ല.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Even if the title deeds of the property are also sent along with the application the Forest people do not seem to move in the matter, what remedy has the applicant got?

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): അതൊരുതരം റെറ്ററാണ്. അതിനെ പ്രമാണമായിട്ട് ഹാജരാക്കാൻ സാധിക്കുമോ?

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Will it not be better to leave it to the parties to contest in a court of law?

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): അങ്ങിനെ വരുമ്പോൾ ഫോറസ്റ്റ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റുകാർ ഒരു വിഷയം വരുന്നു. വാസ്തവത്തിൽ അവകാശിയായ ഒരാളിന്റെ പുരയിടത്തിൽനിന്നും തടിക്കൊണ്ടുപോകുന്നതിനു വേറെ ഒരാൾക്കു പാസ്സുകൊടുക്കുന്നപക്ഷം വസ്തു ഉടമസ്ഥന്റെ നഷ്ടത്തിനു ഫോറസ്റ്റ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റുകാർ ഉത്തരം പറയേണ്ടിവരും.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I know whether the member is aware that the Deputy President in the course of the discussion on the former resolution gave expression to the following idea?

"For instance, if the Forest Department is not doing its duty properly, if within the two or three months mentioned in the rules, no free pass is issued, then the rule should be so modified as to allow the people to remove the timber and intimate the fact to the proper authorities."

Is the member aware of that statement?

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): ഡിപ്യൂട്ടി പ്രസിഡണ്ടു പറഞ്ഞതു എന്നെ ബന്ധിക്കുമെന്നു എനിക്കു തോന്നുന്നില്ല. ഒരുമെമ്പർ വായിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു ശരിയാണെന്നു സമ്മതിക്കാതെ തരമില്ലല്ലോ? അതുകൊണ്ടു എന്താണ് വേണ്ടതു്?

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Has he got any objection to enable an applicant after waiting for a long period in excess of the period provided for in the rules to remove the timber from his own land if the delay is caused by the issuing authorities?

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): ഫോറസ്റ്റ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിൽ നിന്നും മനഃപൂർവ്വം ഒരാളുടെ ഹർജിയെ താമസിപ്പിക്കുന്നു എന്നു ബോധ്യം വരുമ്പോൾ കാലാവധികഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടു തടിക്കൊണ്ടു വരുന്നതിനു വിരോധമുണ്ടെന്നു ഞാൻ പറയുന്നില്ല.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Is he prepared to provide for such a contingency in the rules?

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): ഞാൻ പറയുന്നതിനായിട്ടാണെങ്കിൽ എനിക്ക് വിരോധമില്ല.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): What is the essential object of the Free Pass system? Is it merely to give a certificate that a timber proposed to be removed does not belong to the Government? I think that is the only object. Then why should the Conservator of Forests look into the title deeds?

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): ഇന്നാരുടെ പുരയിടത്തിൽനിന്നും എന്തെങ്കിലും വിവരം അറിയാതെ അവർ എങ്ങനെ പാസ്സ് കൊടുക്കും?

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): If it is known that it is not Government property what objection is there? Suppose there is a dispute between two parties then there is the Civil Court opened to them for contesting the matter of delay. That is the main cause of the difficulty now.

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): അന്യ പുരയിടങ്ങളിൽനിന്നും തടി മുറിച്ചുകൊണ്ടുപോകുന്നതിനു പാസ്സ് കൊടുക്കുന്നതായാൽ ഉടമസ്ഥന്റെ നഷ്ടം ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റു കൊടുക്കേണ്ടിവരുന്നതുകൊണ്ടായിരിക്കാം അങ്ങനെ ചെയ്യാത്തത്.

MR. C. P. TARAKAN (*Kunnathnad*): ഇങ്ങനെ ഒരു പാസ്സ് വേണ്ടെന്നുവെച്ചാൽ ഫാറസ്റ്റ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റുകാരുടെ ഭാരം കറയുകയില്ലേ?

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): ഞാൻ ഇതു പറഞ്ഞതു കേട്ടിരുന്നുവെങ്കിൽ ഈ ചോദ്യത്തിന്നവകാശം വരികയില്ലായിരുന്നു.

MR. C. P. TARAKAN (*Kunnathnad*): മിസ്റ്റർ നാരായണപിള്ളയുടെ താലൂക്കിൽ ഫാറസ്റ്റ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റിലെ സബാർഡിനേറ്റ് ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാർ ജനങ്ങൾക്കുശേഷം അസൗകര്യമുണ്ടാകാത്തവിധത്തിൽ പ്രീ പാസ്പേക്കുകളെ തീരുമാനിച്ചു വരുന്നു എന്നു ഏതെങ്കിലും പറയുന്നതിൽ സന്തോഷിക്കുകയും അതേ സമയം തന്നെ അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ താലൂക്കിലുള്ള ആളുകൾ പാസ്പേർപ്പാടില്ലാതായാൽ വന്നത്തിലുള്ള തടികൾ മുഴുവനും മോഷ്ടിച്ച് വെട്ടിയിറക്കുന്നതിനു തക്കവണ്ണം സ്വഭാവമുണ്ടെന്നു ഇല്ലാത്തവരെന്നു കേട്ടതിൽ ദുഃഖിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നു. എന്റെ താലൂക്കിലെ അനുഭവം നേരെ മറിച്ചാണ്. പ്രീ പാസ്സ് കൊടുക്കണമെന്നുള്ളതു തടിയെ സംബന്ധിച്ചാണ്. കുറച്ചോ കയ്യാവൊ

[Mr. C. P. Tarakan.]

പോലെ പാക്കറ്റിൽ ഇട്ടു കൊണ്ടു പോകത്തക്ക സാധനമല്ല തടി. വനത്തിൽ നിന്നും മുറിച്ചു ആറുവഴി ഒഴുകിക്കൊണ്ടു പോകാനെ നിവർത്തിയുള്ളൂ. ആറു ഇല്ലാത്ത സ്ഥലമാണെങ്കിൽ റോഡിൽ കൂടെ വണ്ടിയിലോ ആനയെക്കൊണ്ടു വലിപ്പിച്ചോ അല്ലെങ്കിൽ ട്രാക്ടർ മിഷ്സിനിലും വെച്ചോ ആളുകൾ കാണത്തക്ക വിധത്തിലും അറിവോടുകൂടിയും മാത്രമേ ഏതെങ്കിലും സ്ഥലത്തു കൊണ്ടു പോകാൻ സാധിക്കുകയുള്ളൂ. ചില സ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽ മോഷ്ടാക്കളായ ആളുകൾ വനങ്ങളിൽ നിന്നും തടിമുറിച്ചു അറുത്തു ചില്ലറയാക്കി കൊണ്ടുപോകുന്നുമുണ്ട്.

ഇതിനെ തടയുന്നതിന് പ്രിപാസ്സ് ഒരു വിധത്തിലും ഉപയോഗപ്പെടുത്തില്ല. വനത്തിനുള്ളിൽ കയറി ഇങ്ങിനെ തടി മുറിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു പോകുന്നവരുടെ കൈവശം പ്രിപാസ്സുണ്ടോ എന്ന് അന്വേഷിച്ചു കണ്ടു പിടിക്കുന്നതിനും വളരെ പ്രയാസമാണ്. റോഡിൽ കൂടി കൊണ്ടു പോകുന്നവർക്കു ഇതൊരു വലിയ ബുദ്ധിമുട്ടുമാണ്.

സ്വന്തം പുരയിടത്തിൽ തടി ഉണ്ടെങ്കിൽ അവിടുത്തെ ഡിപ്പൂട്ടി കൺസർവേറ്ററുമാരെക്കൂടി അദ്ദേഹത്തെ ബോധ്യപ്പെടുത്തിയതിനുശേഷം മാത്രമേ തടികൊണ്ടു പോകാൻ സാധിക്കുകയുള്ളൂ. ഫാറസ്റ്റ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റിലെ കീഴ്വോഴസ്ഥാനാരുടെ സമ്മതത്തോടുകൂടിയും ഇല്ലാതെയും കാണാതെയും പലസ്ഥലത്തും കളവു നടത്തിക്കൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്നു.

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (Pattanamtitta): റിസർവുകളിൽ മോഷണം നടത്തിക്കൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്നു എന്നു മെമ്പർ സമ്മതിക്കുമോ?

MR. C. P. TARAKAN (Kunnatnad): പൂർണ്ണമായി സമ്മതിക്കാം.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha): എല്ലാ താലൂക്കിലും വനത്തിൽനിന്നും തടി മോഷ്ടിച്ചുകൊണ്ടുപോകുന്നത് കീഴ്വോഴസ്ഥാനാരുടെ സമ്മതത്തോടുകൂടിയാണെങ്കിൽ ഇങ്ങിനെയുള്ള മോഷണത്തെ തടക്കാൻ പ്രിപാസ്സുൾ ഉപയോഗപ്പെടുമോ?

MR. C. P. TARAKAN (Kunnatnad): ഇല്ല.

MR. KURANDIPALLIL R. RAMAN PILLAI (Quilon): ഇത് സംഗതികൾ കൺസർവേറ്ററെ അറിയിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. C. P. TARAKAN (Kunnatnad): അങ്ങിനെ കൊണ്ടുപോകുന്നതായി ഞാൻ ഒരിക്കലും കണ്ടിട്ടില്ല. കണ്ടിരുന്നു എങ്കിൽ അറിയിക്കുമായിരുന്നു. ഈ പ്രിപാസ്സ് സിസ്റ്റം നല്ലതല്ലെന്നാണ് എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): Sir, the Conservator of Forests has been insisting that things are done in the best way possible in the best of all possible departments. The representatives of the people who have been sufferers by the operation of the rules of the Forest Department or by the method or the spirit in which the rules are operated have been equally insistent that things are not done in the best way possible and that there is something wrong in the State of Denmark. Possibly this irreconcilable outlook between the Department and the public may be due to the different attitude or angle of vision adopted by the two parties. The tendency of the Department, so far as I have any personal experience in the matter, is always to somehow twist matters and cause the maximum amount of trouble and inconvenience. There is a famous case in which I had the misfortune to figure. Myself and two others purchased a small tea estate about 150 acres in extent and ultimately when the matter had gone the round of the rules of the Forest Department we had a notice from the Dewan Peishkar that we had to pay a lakh and twenty six thousand rupees as timber value, and that if we did not pay the amount not only this tea estate but also our other property will be sold away. Naturally we were in a fix. I went and saw the Conservator Mr. Raman Menon later on. He admitted to me that it was a stupid and silly mistake. The present Conservator also said that it was a foolish thing. The Dewan asked me if I could pay Rs. 10,000. I refused even that and asked for a detailed investigation. Finally a committee was appointed and it recommended that the maximum amount leviable on each wooded acre should be levied from me. It came to Rs. 6,000. It was at that time that the present Conservator became the Head of the Department. He said that we should pay Rs. 4,000 more. It was due for putting up buildings. But the whole timber was worth only Rs. 6,000. Finally the Dewan Peishkar of Kottayam reported that it was an absurd thing to ask for Rs. 4,000 more.

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): A word of personal explanation, Sir. I may be permitted to say that I never reported like that. It was done on the order of Government. And I also do not know whether the Kottayam Dewan Peishkar said it was a stupid thing or not. I had nothing to do with the matter.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): I rise to a point of order. Are we examining a case?

PRESIDENT: It sounds like it.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): I was saying the way in which the operations of the Department are carried on causes very serious difficulties. Finally I had to pay Rs. 6,000 and there the matter ended. The general impression is that I had been bribed to the extent of a lakh and twenty thousand rupees.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolam*): What has this to do with the resolution?

PRESIDENT: XII No. 5.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): I began by saying that there is something wrong about the method or the spirit in which the rules are worked by the Department. I am merely giving an outstanding example.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): May I know whether the incident was before the students' strike?

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): I do not remember the date.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): Was it before 1927?

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): I do not remember the exact date. Now I understand the connection of the question. I first of all forgot it. I think the question is put because I supported Government in the students' strike; there was a lot of talk about me.

PRESIDENT: You are getting off the tract a lot.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): Excuse me.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): Sir, I support the opposition to the resolution (*Laughter*). I think it is good English. I think it is only a few months since the very same matter was once discussed and rejected by this House. I should also accept the wide principle that individual property should be recognised by the State and everything to safeguard that must be done by the members of this House. I thought after the resolution was rejected last time the mover of the resolution this time may have some additional information to convert this House to his side. If by his speech before this House he was able to substantiate the general word *sankatam* by facts and figures, we would have changed our minds and supported the mover. With a view to understand the gravity, I questioned whether there was a single instance in which the hardship caused was brought to the notice of the authorities concerned. From the mover I did not get any answer. So I asked the Conservator whether he received any complaint. He said that if there was any undue delay there would have been a complaint. He said that there was no instance which has come to his notice. That again I thought was sufficient ground once again to reject the resolution. The other aspect of the question has also to be considered. When a particular resolution was rejected by this House after a considerable discussion and spending some time over it, again if the very same resolution is discussed and that without additional grounds, I think, it is a waste of time. It was on these two grounds that I wanted to oppose this resolution.

There is also another aspect to be considered, *viz.*, the income of the Forest Department. I take this opportunity to say, Sir, that the revenue derived from the rich forests of Travancore is not what it ought to be. And the administration of the Forest Department also, I think, is far from satisfactory. A vigilant administration of the forests must without any doubt produce more revenue. I say that by drawing

a comparison between the forests in British India and those in Travancore. Therefore whatever may be the principle involved in the resolution as a matter of policy when the Conservator himself comes to the House and tells us that the abolition of the free pass system will do hardship on the Forest Department, if we rise and say again that the income is not what it ought to be, the Conservator will simply turn the tables upon us and say "you abolished the free pass system, and therefore the revenue has gone down."

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Torala*): Does the free pass system bring any revenue to Government?

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): Certainly, indirectly. If I am permitted to say what the state of affairs would be in the absence of the free pass system, probably it may provoke thoughts which may not altogether be very happy to this House and the good citizens of the State. The man who works the free pass system knows how to play the cards. He can even see things managed forgetting for a moment the existence of these rules. Therefore apart from the general grievance, I think particularly there is no actual grievance felt by the people at large at the existence of the rules. Therefore what I say is that where the Conservator can increase the revenue of the department, I think, we ought to help him in doing away with smuggling.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): May I know from the member whether he had ever occasion to apply for a free pass and to remove timber?

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): Yes, I had occasion during last year. In the month of Minam 1101, I got a free pass. Perhaps I am a poor man and so I may not have occasions to apply for it very often.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): What does the member say about the suggestion of Mr. Raman Menon that the applicants may be allowed to fell the trees if a delay of more than one month occurs in the granting of a free pass?

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): I will answer that. You may apply, but that application may be sleeping for more than six months in another department. There is no use of blaming the Forest Department.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): Is that the objection?

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): You may apply through the Anchal Department, but the application may be directed to Peermade.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): Suppose the application is sent by registered Anchal?

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): Registered applications are also misdirected. My friend is proceeding upon a wrong data. When there is a rule you will have to obey that rule.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): The question is about the changing of the existing rules.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): From the beginning I said that I am in perfect agreement with the principle involved in the resolution. But I am not satisfied with the arguments of the mover of this resolution as to the actual existence of any grievance. There is no data to change the mind of the House which has decided the question in a particular way.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): Has not Mr. Kunjittomman said that there was actual grievance?

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): I interpellated the Conservator and he said that there was no instance.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): Did he ask Mr. Kunjittomman whether there was any grievance?

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): I need not have asked; he ought to have said.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): Did he ask Mr. Kunjittomman about this?

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): All the other members asked, so I thought it was not necessary for me to ask again and waste the time of the House.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Does the member know that in Royal Proclamation of 1074, relating to the construction of places of worships, an applicant has got to be given an endorsement within 90 days. In case the Government did not give that permission within the time the applicant could construct the place of public worship. Is the member aware of that provision?

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): I take the information from the member.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I know from the member whether there could not be any such provision incorporated in the free pass rules?

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): There is no analogy, I submit. You may build a temple or a church. That does not in any way affect the State.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Is it not the birthright of every one to enjoy his own property?

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): I concede that proposition.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Should not his birthright be conceded in this way?

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): I have conceded it in my own way. If the member wants to thrust his arguments into my head, I am not prepared to follow it. What I submit is that if the revenue from the forests has to be more safeguarded then the free pass system cannot be abolished. But I have no objection to ask the Conservator to see what he can do in this matter. With these words I oppose the resolution.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Sir, I wish to speak a few words on the resolution. I am sorry I have to submit that I do not see eye to eye on the actual principle underlying the resolution. But I endorse the sentiments of Mr. Kunjitomman and most of the members of this House while they spoke in support of the resolution. If I understood correctly the members who spoke in opposition I think they said that there was no new case made out by Mr. Kunjitomman since a motion of an identical nature was moved before the House when it was rejected. The argument was that there was no complaint as to the working of the rules received by the authorities concerned. But if the opposition is solely built upon this ground alone I may be permitted to say, Sir, that there was not only a complaint but a very very serious complaint ending in the great damage by the applicant himself. A very respectable and retired gentleman from South Travancore who owns six hundred and twenty acres had the audacity to sue the Government for damages in a court of law. The first time the application was objected as there were rival claimants. However the applicant's claim was allowed and pass issued. But there was considerable delay in regard to subsequent applications for free pass.

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): The case is sub-judice. I do not think the member can refer to it.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): I am not referring to the case at all. He was obliged to give notice to the Government to sue for damages since the pass was not granted. That is one instance.

MR. C. P. THOMAS (*Nominated*): May I know whether it was after that the rules of 1924 were framed?

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Yes. That gentleman was obliged to sell away that land to a contractor of the department who is now able to get free passes very frequently. That is the instance of a responsible and retired official. If the only argument was that there was no instance of any grievance against the rules, this instance will convince the oppositionists.

I do endorse the statement that the rules are intended to safeguard the revenue of the forests. But the private rights of individuals should not be undermined. I am also glad to hold that the Government have got the primary duty to see to the proper enjoyment of private rights. In that view I can say that the Government have a right to enforce the rules if those rules are necessary. But I am opposed to the way in which these rules are being worked. If as a matter of fact for any reason whatsoever the department does not show promptness in the disposal of free passes there should be an enabling provision in the rules to allow the applicants to remove the timber without any free pass after a certain period.

When I interrupted the Deputy President as to whether he is in favour of putting in a provision so as to enable the applicants to remove their timber after the lapse of the prescribed period, he was

[Mr. M. Sivatanu Pillai.]

not prepared to accept that statement. In order to refresh the memory of the Deputy President I took up the opportunity of interrupting the member by putting into his mind the statement of his.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): I was just reading over my speech and I find that I distinctly stated that if there are any irregularities in the working of the present rules that cause inconvenience and delay to the people at large, then I would even go to the length of saying that the rules should be modified. There may be defects in the existing rules, I admit. If there are defects in the existing rules, those defects must be brought to the notice of the authorities and we should know what they say about them and how they would rectify them.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): My question is whether he has any objection to have a provision as is obtaining in the Proclamation of 1074 in the matter of giving grants to places of public-worship. So I was led to believe that the Deputy President was of opinion that the rules should be so modified as to enable the owners of private lands in reserved areas getting the right of removing timber in case no free pass is issued within the period specified.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): In case of delay in the issue of free pass, the particular owner must be at liberty to remove the timber of his own accord.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Certainly, such a provision is necessary.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): May I point out one difficulty? Delay constitutes the right of removing timber while the party interested would like to have it delayed.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Then the whole machinery of Government should be undermined. I am surprised to see that, of all persons, Mr. A. K. Pillai who is very zealous of the elementary rights of every citizen and who has been advocating here in season and out of season that the elementary right of ownership should be recognised, should suggest that all these things should be done at the whims and fancies of the department concerned. I wish to point out that in the interests of public good and forest reservation, I am at one with the Government that there should be absolutely a restricting provision in the matter of enjoying freely one's own private land. But in protecting individual rights of owners of lands it is necessary that their individual rights should be recognised and the rules modified as to enable the applicant to remove timber from his own land in case the department concerned are not so alert or vigilant to give prompt disposal of applications. It is up to them to see that individual rights are not curtailed. For that, it is not necessary that the mover of the resolution should come prepared with facts and figures. The very fact that he has brought up this resolution for discussion once again shows that there is a serious danger and

hardship done to private individuals. As such, the members of this House have no other way but to accept the resolution in the light of the grievances expressed by the mover.

MR. K. SIVARAMA PANIKKAR (*Shertallai*): If instead of allowing the owner to take away timber in case of delay, will he be satisfied if the person responsible to the issue of free pass is taken to task for such delay?

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): That is why persons are put to the necessity of suing for damages. Of course individuals concerned cannot always be held responsible for the purpose of delaying the matter. It is not possible for the party to sue the subordinates of the departments in cases of delay. What I would urge is that the rules should be modified in such a manner as to cause least hardship to persons who own private lands within reserved areas. Their right to enjoy private lands should be recognised by the Government. Then alone, the duty of Government to impose a restriction in the interest of public good comes in. So I am not for the resolution as it stands at present. If Mr. Kunjitomman accepts my amendments that there should be an enabling provision to enable the applicants to remove timber of their own accord in case of delay beyond the period fixed, then I do see my way to support the resolution as amended.

MR. C. P. KOCHUKUNJU PILLAI (*Kottarakara cum Kunnattur*): I am one of those who supported the resolution of Mr. Kunjitomman when he moved it last time. But I regret very much that I have to oppose the resolution in its present form. My first ground of objection is, that it is dangerous to pass or accept the resolution as it is. The resolution which was moved by Mr. Kunjitomman last time proposed the cancellation of a pass for removing all trees except Royal trees. But on looking at the present resolution it would appear to cover a proposal for cancellation of pass for removing Royal trees as well. The resolution as it stands runs thus:—

"This Council recommends to the Government that the present rule which lays down that a pass from the Forest Department is necessary for felling and removing the trees and bamboos standing on private lands be cancelled."

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolan*): Has the member any objection to support the resolution if Royal trees are excluded?

MR. C. P. KOCHUKUNJU PILLAI (*Kottarakara cum Kunnattur*): That is not before me now. So that, if this resolution is accepted and passed in its present form it is really dangerous because Mr. Kunjitomman himself would concede that a cancellation of the pass to transport the Royal trees is not one that will be decided now.

MR. A. J. JOHN (*Vaikam*): Mr. Kunjitomman said that he did not include Royal trees in the present resolution.

MR. C. P. KOCHUKUNJU PILLAI (*Kottarakara cum Kunnattur*): We are to discuss the resolution as it is and we have either to accept or reject it. So I am concerned with the resolution as it stands at present. That is my first ground of objection.

[Mr. C. P. Kochukunju Pillai.]

Second ground of objection is a matter of change of conviction. Ever since the decision of this Council, which I believe was in April 1926, I was enquiring whether so much of smuggling of timber from Forests existed as was said by the official member, the Conservator of forests. Sir, my enquiry has resulted in a thorough change of opinion with regard to this subject under discussion. Very many cases of smuggling of timber from forests have reached my ears during the course of the period. In some cases Sir, very big and influential persons were also involved as having been conniving at smuggling.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): Are they officials or non-officials?

MR. C. P. KOCHUKUNJU PILLAI (*Kottarakara cum Kunnattur*): I am not prepared to answer that question. I was surprised to see in some cases that servants of these big men had to be pushed forward to the Court and admit the offence. All the number of cases that have reached my ears convinces me that the decision arrived at by this Council was correct. That is to say, a rule of restriction in the matter of smuggling is absolutely necessary and therefore I had to change my opinion.

My third ground is one that has already been spoken by Mr. Subba Aiyar. It is only a year since this Council arrived at a decision that the cancellation of a free pass was not necessary. Of course if I remember correct 33 of us were against the resolution while only 13 were in favour of the resolution. Now I find that no new facts have been brought forward by the mover of the resolution to the satisfaction of this Council to arrive at a different conclusion from the one which we arrived at so early in April. With these few words, I oppose the resolution.

MR. C. P. THOMAS (*Nominated*): I should like to have my impression in regard to the existence of a provision whereby certain areas are excluded from the operation of this free pass rule namely areas that are far removed from Reserved Forests. If I remember right, when this was discussed last time I remember to have read a passage in the rules to the effect that certain geographical areas are excluded from the operation of this free pass. I shall be obliged if the Conservator will enlighten me as to the correctness of my position.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): He must have questioned the Conservator when he was in possession of the House.

MR. C. P. THOMAS (*Nominated*): If certain areas are so excluded I think a certain amount of the grievances complained of would disappear. Otherwise, I would strongly plead for the exclusion of certain areas as has been pointed out by some of my friends here. While it is necessary the forest produce should not be smuggled I cannot see why areas like Ambalapuzha, Vaikam (Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai hoar, hear) and several other places should suffer from the operation of this rule so long as there is no chance of the people residing in these parts doing anything which would injure the revenues from Reserved Forests.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*) : Does the member want Ayroor to be excluded ?

MR. C. P. THOMAS (*Nominated*) : I found that Ayroor was excluded and several other places were also excluded.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*) : Does the member consider that the exclusion of Ayroor, Eravipuram and other places situated near forests from the operation of the free pass is advisable ?

MR. C. P. THOMAS (*Nominated*) : As Eraviperur is not within the proximity of reserved forests, it is right that it has been excluded. It has been suggested that no complaints have been received from the people. Mr. Sivatanu Pillai gave a very striking instance where a citizen was put to much inconvenience on account of delay caused in the matter of issuing free pass. The fact that the average citizen does not make complaints about a subordinate officer of the Forest Department, does not necessarily show that there are not such citizens suffering. He knows that in the long run that it would be safer for him not to make complaints about these officers and thus bring on himself more troubles. Being a wise man he might have thought it prudent that it would be better for him to suffer a little rather than bring greater troubles on him. If we are sure that there is delay in the granting of these licenses, it is better that such delays are reported periodically by the subordinate officers to superior officers giving information about the applications for free pass and the time within which such licenses were to be granted. Unless we have got some such information I do not think we can rely upon the absence of complaints directly made as proving that there has been really no cause for complaints.

One cause of delay has been due to the fact that there is difficulty in finding out whether a person who makes the application has really a title to the property concerned. As has been pointed out by Mr. Mammen Mappillai and others I cannot see why the Forest Department should at all concern itself with the question of such rights. Now if a person asks permission and with the permission of the Forest Department he removes timber which does not belong to him that is a matter for the real owner and a civil or criminal court.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*) : Is that the view of the member that all applicants must be allowed to take away timber so long as that does not affect the interests of the department ?

MR. C. P. THOMAS (*Nominated*) : I cannot understand why the department should trouble themselves about that.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*) : Is that the rule that every application has got to be followed by the title deed ?

MR. C. P. THOMAS (*Nominated*) : Let the Forest Department follow that rule, we have no objection. In order to ascertain whether a title deed could give any benefit to an individual in respect of the property, that is the question we have to consider. Whenever an application is made for a license, the departmental authorities should not wait to ascertain whether he is the owner of the property.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Can the member visualise any circumstances under which an application can be disallowed?

MR. G. P. THOMAS (*Nominated*): If the department thinks that it would in any way affect the revenues of the forest or the reservation of the Reserved Forests, then it is right for the department to safeguard the interests of Government by not issuing free pass.

With regard to the difficulty of sending petitions and misdirecting them to other places I think it can be very well provided for by securing that registered applications should be sent and that a receipt of the addressee should be preserved as evidence that an application has been sent. Now if these remedies can be provided for I am willing to agree to the free pass rule being maintained. If Government cannot provide any of these remedies I think that the free pass rule as it is now is likely to cause unnecessary trouble to the citizens. Therefore I support the resolution.

MR. K. SVARAMA PANIKKAR (*Shertallai*): Sir, in opposing the spirit of the resolution I must acknowledge that there is some weight in the arguments adduced by the supporters of this resolution saying that it infringes the private ownership of lands. If this system of issuing free pass is altogether removed I am afraid that it will encourage a sort of smuggling that ought not be encouraged. It should not be the aim of any representative of the people to encourage any system of making public property a private one. It is my view Sir, that if the system of free pass is completely taken away it will encourage smuggling. From the fact that Mr. Kunjitomman has brought this resolution in the shape of a motion last time also, it is clear that there is some grievance for the public with regard to the issue of license for transporting timber from one private land to another place. Therefore this delay has to be checked. Instead of allowing a private owner to transport timber after a fixed period as has been suggested by some of the members I will suggest that the officer who is responsible for the delay should be brought to book and there should be scope for a cause of action against him.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Does the present resolution help in that direction?

MR. K. SVARAMA PANIKKAR (*Shertallai*): No.

What I say is that a change ought to be made in that way. If the existing rules regarding issue of free pass do not help an individual, a modification of the rules might be made in that direction and the existing grievance as pointed out by a few members on this side of the House removed.

MR. C. P. THOMAS (*Nominated*): May I know from the member whether the applicant who suffers will in any way be benefited?

MR. K. SVARAMA PANIKKAR (*Shertallai*): That is why I said that there should be a cause of action against an officer who is responsible for issuing a license. That is what I want to impress upon the attention of the House. There should be an opportunity to sue the man who is responsible for the delay. There should be an opportunity. But

on that ground he should not be allowed to take away the timber. It is not a question of title deed. It may be that the timber in his possession may be the timber that is smuggled away from the forests before the officer can ascertain whether it is private timber. He could not issue a license except under extraordinary conditions. So what I say is, the man who is responsible for the delay in the matter of issuing license might be punished and brought to book if he is really found faulty.

The Council rose for lunch at 1.57 P. M. and reassembled at 2.47 P. M.

PRESIDENT : If it is entirely convenient to the members, I propose that we should have another sitting tomorrow to take up Government business, as it could not have been proceeded with owing to our adjournment for the day. The business we have is the consideration of the Select Committee's report on the Irrigation Regulation Amending Bill, the introduction of the Abkari Regulation Amending Bill and the introduction of the Probate and Administration Bill. I say that if it is entirely convenient to the members we can proceed with the consideration of these things tomorrow. We will now proceed with the discussion of Mr. Kunjitomman's resolution.

MR. M. SUBRAHMANYA PILLAI (*Agastisvaram*): Sir, I beg to oppose the resolution that is under discussion. If I remember correctly, I have done the same thing when a similar resolution was under discussion sometime last year in this Council. But it is not my idea to repeat the arguments that have already been put forth by several speakers here. I should like to say a few words about one or two suggestions thrown by one or two of my friends on this side of the House. Mr. Kumara Pillai suggested that watch stations may be established in different localities on the Forest line and then efficient checking may be done there, and that the free pass system may not be insisted upon in the plains. With regard to that, I am unable to agree with him that an effective control against the smuggling of timber could be had by means of watch stations alone when we consider the length of the Forest line that we have to protect and also the nature of the marginal line where we see registered lands and forest lands come in such close contact and extend the marginal line to a considerable extent. Moreover, the most important way through which the timber is smuggled is through water-ways, and especially during the times of floods and during the rainy seasons, smuggling can be done very easily and from the interior of the forest timber can be removed 20 or 30 miles far into the plains within one night and for this a control by mere watch stations alone will, I think, not be sufficiently effective.

Again, Sir, my friend Mr. Tarakan himself admitted that smuggling is going on to a considerable extent even at the present moment.

MR. C. P. TARAKAN (*Kunnatnad*): I did not say "to a considerable extent".

MR. M. SUBRAHMANYA PILLAI (*Agastisvaram*): Well, anyhow, he has admitted that it is still going on. That, I think, Sir, is argument enough for me to say that the present free pass system should be retained and should be continued as it is.

Sir, since we arrived at a conclusion last year the thing has been going on quite smoothly and from the statistics, already given us by the Conservator, I do not think that sufficient arguments have been put forth for a reconsideration of this question. Of course, after the arguments given during the last year and also this time, it is not my idea to repeat such arguments already given by several members, and I cut short my speech and simply state that I oppose the resolution now under discussion here.

MR. KURANDIPALLIL R. RAMAN PILLAI (*Quilon*): പ്രീപാസ്സിസ്സം ചുവടെ നിർത്തണമെന്നുള്ള പ്രമേയത്തോടുകൂടി യോജിക്കുന്നതിന്നു എനിക്ക് അനുമതിയില്ല. എന്നാൽ മിസ്റ്റർ കൺസർവ്വേറ്റർ പഠിത്ത സംഗതികളിൽ അടങ്ങിയിട്ടുള്ള തത്വത്തെ പ്രവൃത്തിയിൽ കൊണ്ടുവരുന്നതിന്നു ഫോറസ്റ്റ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റുകാർ കൂടുതൽ പ്രവൃത്തിക്കണമെന്നാണ് എനിക്കു പറയാനുള്ളത്. ഇപ്പോൾതന്നെ ഈ റൂൾസ് നടപ്പിൽ ഇരുത്തിയും ഫോറസ്റ്റ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിലുള്ള കുറ്റങ്ങൾ കൂടികൂടി വരുന്നതായിട്ടാണ് റിപ്പോർട്ടുകൊണ്ടുകാണുന്നത്. മറ്റു മന്ദ-ബ-ഭരണകീഴ്ചകളിൽ ഇപ്രകാരം പ്രസ്താവിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു.

"The total number of Forest offences reported during the year was 1,362 against 1,305 in 1926, of which the majority of cases related as in the previous year, to illicit collection, possession or removal of timber or of minor Forest produce."

അതുകൊണ്ടു പ്രീപാസ്സിസ്സം നടപ്പിൽ ഇരുത്തിയും ഇപ്രകാരമുള്ള കുറ്റങ്ങൾ കൂടിവരുന്നതു ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റുകാരുടെ ഭരണത്തിന്റെ ന്യായതകൊണ്ടാണോ എന്തുകൊണ്ടാണ് എന്നു പറയാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): അതിനെ പരിഹരിക്കുന്നതിന്നു എന്റെ പ്രമേയത്തിലടങ്ങിയിരിക്കുന്ന തത്വം പര്യാപ്തമാണോ എന്നു ഒന്നു പരീക്ഷിച്ചുനോക്കുന്നതു ഉത്തമമായിരിക്കുമല്ലോ?

MR. KURANDIPALLIL R. RAMAN PILLAI (*Quilon*): എന്നാൽ കുറ്റങ്ങൾ കുറയ്ക്കുക വളർക്കുമെന്നാണ് എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ഒന്നു പരീക്ഷിച്ചുനോക്കരുതോ?

MR. KURANDIPALLIL R. RAMAN PILLAI (*Quilon*): പരീക്ഷിച്ചുനോക്കിയതിനുശേഷമാണെല്ലോ റൂൾസെല്ലാം ഏർപ്പെടുത്തിയത്.

MR. C. P. FARAKAN (*Kunnathnad*): മോഷണം തീരെ ഇല്ലാതെ ഇരുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് ചീനൽക്കോട്ട വേണ്ടെന്നുവയ്ക്കാമോ?

MR. KURANDIPALLIL R. RAMAN PILLAI (*Quilon*): ഈ ഫിറീപാസ് കൊടുക്കുന്നതിൽ ജനങ്ങൾക്കുണ്ടാകുന്ന സങ്കടങ്ങളെ പരിഹരിക്കുന്നതിന്നു ഇപ്പോൾ നടപ്പിലുള്ള ചട്ടത്തെ കുറുകടി ഉയർത്തിയപ്പോൾത്തന്നെ മി: കുഞ്ഞുഞ്ഞാമ്മന്റെ അഭിപ്രായത്തോടു ഞാൻ യോജിക്കുന്നു. അല്ലാതെ ഈസിസ്റ്റം ചുവടെ മാറ്റണമെന്നുള്ള അഭിപ്രായം എനിക്കില്ല.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): Sir, the question before the House is, I believe, purely one of fact. Mr. Kunjitomman, the mover of the resolution, has stated that even after the passing of the rules in 1924 people feel much grievance, whereas the Conservator of Forests says that at present there is no hardship whatever, or at any rate, that he has not come across any instance of such grievances. Till I listened to the speech of Mr. Sivatanu Pillai, I had myself my doubt whether the position taken up by the Conservator may not be true. But, after hearing Mr. Sivatanu Pillai, I am persuaded to believe that in spite of the ignorance of the Conservator in this matter, people, as a matter of fact, are still suffering under the working of these rules. In these circumstances, I would suggest that the present rules regarding the free pass system should be reconsidered and modified. Of course, the resolution as it stands, is for cancelling the present rules. So there may not perhaps be any harm in supporting the resolution or even opposing it, as it stands. In supporting the resolution, the spirit contained in it that the present rule should be cancelled and new rules should be framed to suit to the present conditions can be emphasised. So, I think one would be perfectly right in supporting it, viewed from this standpoint. From a different point of view one may perhaps be justified even in opposing it. Anyhow, we all feel that difficulties are being felt even now and it is incumbent on the part of the Government to reconsider the matter and revise the rules.

I would specially make mention about the suggestion put forward by Mr. G. Raman Menon and supported by Mr. Sivatanu Pillai. The real difficulty now arises on account of the delay in granting these passes. That is a fact which is admitted by the Conservator also. If there is delay, people will really find it difficult to fell and remove trees and bamboos. So, if, after the putting in of an application, the delay is caused on account of the laches on the part of the Forest Department, it is only fair that the applicant should be given permission for felling down the trees and removing them and in this view the present rule should be cancelled and sufficient provision should be made enabling the applicant to fell and remove the trees if, within a prescribed time, the Forest Department does not take action on their application. Mr. K. P. Nilakanta Pillai was suggesting that this may lead to malpractices on the part of the Forest Department. But I do not think that that should stand in the way of making a fair provision in these Forest rules.

MR. M. SUBRAHMANYA PILLAI (*Agastisvaram*): Does the member know that the estate to which Mr. Sivatanu Pillai referred is a matter of litigation between the Government and the owner of the estate?

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): I do not know anything about it. I only know what he said.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): By way of personal explanation I wish to say that the ownership is not in question but only the question of damages is being taken up in the Civil Court.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): Sir, I am thankful to Mr. Sivatanu Pillai for having reminded me of another point *viz.*, the question of title. I believe that the object of this free pass system is only to show that the trees and bamboos do not stand in Reserve Forests. That is the only significance of this free pass. That is how I understand it. So, the question of title between different claimants does not really arise in the case of granting these free passes. The Forest Department is simply concerned to give a certificate to the effect that the trees intended to be cut do not stand in the Reserve Forest. The responsibility of the Forest Department goes only to that extent. If there are other claimants the matter can be litigated either in the Civil Court or in the Criminal Court.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): May I know from the member whether there is any Regulation or rules passed under any Regulation which show that after a period if the Government do not give the necessary sanction the individuals may cut the trees according to their own will and pleasure?

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): I do not think there is any provision enabling the applicant to cut off and remove trees after any limited period. But in the case of constructing places of worship there is provision allowing the applicant to begin the work if no orders are passed on the application within a prescribed time. With these observations I support the principle contained in the resolution of Mr. Kunjitomman to the extent of saying that the present rule may be cancelled and better rules may be framed in connection therewith.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Sir, I regret that I am unable to support the resolution in spite of the gibe thrown at me. After listening to the learned speeches made by Mr. Mammen Mappillai and Mr. Sivatanu Pillai I am persuaded to conclude that modification is necessary in the rules. But it is tightening the rules rather than taking away the restrictions that is sought for by the resolution. The restrictions are there and nobody is prepared to question the need for such restrictions. All that they say is that there is a good deal of inconvenience caused to the public by not giving the pass in time. To obviate the delay I am sure the procedure is not moving a resolution of this nature. To revise the rules a Committee must be appointed or the Government should be moved in the matter. But Mr. Kunjitomman's

resolution, as it stands, is no help at all. I cannot see how we are called upon to support the spirit of the resolution though we may consistently with that position oppose it. We are called upon to decide on the merits of the resolution as contained in the terms of the resolution but not to go behind the resolution and see the spirit or object of it.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I know whether the member is prepared to move an amendment to the resolution?

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): I am not prepared to do anything except oppose the resolution as it stands.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Is it Mr. A. K. Pillai's view that the resolution cannot have a spirit?

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): My point is that the resolution is in a concrete form before the House and we can only proceed on the terms of the resolution and we cannot put our own constructions on the spirit or the motive of the resolution.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I know from the member whether an amendment cannot be moved to the resolution?

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): I cannot object to any amendment being moved. Only, I am not prepared to move any amendment myself.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): Does not the member see that the resolution is only for the purpose of cancelling the present rule?

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Yes.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): So the question is simply about the cancelling of the present rule.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): The resolution does not say anything about the rule. It only says that the existing practice of giving passes must be cancelled. I say passes are necessary. If the Department is not prompt enough to issue passes in time so as to give all facilities to the public, it must be the look-out of the public as well as this House to remove the delay.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): Does Mr. A. K. Pillai think that the present rule is necessary?

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): I say that some rule is necessary.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): Does Mr. A. K. Pillai think that the present rule is necessary?

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): It is necessary, in the absence of other rules. Therefore, I oppose the resolution.

In this connection I may point out to you, Sir, that when we are considering the rules of this House that we often come to a very difficult position. Some members send tens and hundreds of resolutions all of which may not be equally important.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I rise to a point of order.

PRESIDENT: It is not relevant to the point under discussion, Mr. A. K. Pillai.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): I mean that it is not always the important resolution that comes up for discussion.

PRESIDENT: It is irrelevant here.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): If Mr. Kunjitomman wanted only to modify the present rule or rather to provide more facilities for the public, then certainly some provision may have been necessary and there is no difficulty. But as it is I am unable to support the resolution before the House.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): തപാത്തിലും പ്രയോഗത്തിലും ജനങ്ങളുടെ സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യത്തേയും സ്വത്തു സംബന്ധിച്ചുള്ള പ്രഥമാവകാശത്തേയും സാരമായി ബാധിച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുകയും, ഗവണ്മെന്റിനു യാതൊരു ലാഭവും ഉണ്ടാകാതെ നഷ്ടം ഉണ്ടായിക്കൊണ്ടിരിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നതിനു ഹേതുഭൂതമായ ഈ റൂൾസിനെ റദ്ദ് ചെയ്യണമെന്നു ഗവണ്മെന്റിനോടു ശുപാർശ ചെയ്യുന്ന എന്റെ പ്രമേയത്തെ ജനങ്ങളുടെ പ്രതിനിധികളിൽ ഏന്റെ മാനുസ്സേഫിതന്മാരിൽ ചിലർ ഇവിടെ ബലമായി എറുത്തു. ഇതിൽ ഞാൻ സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യം യാതൊന്നും ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചിട്ടില്ല. ജനങ്ങളുടെ പ്രഥമമായ അവകാശത്തേയും സ്വത്തുസംബന്ധിച്ചുള്ള സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യത്തേയും സംരക്ഷിക്കുകയും ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ആദായത്തേയും സൗകര്യത്തേയും വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യണമെന്നു മാത്രമാണ് ഞാൻ ഈ പ്രമേയം കൊണ്ടുദ്ദേശിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളത്. ഇതേ പ്രമേയം തന്നെ ഇതിനു മുമ്പു ഞാൻ ഈ കൗൺസിൽിൽ അവതരിപ്പിക്കുകയും വോട്ടിനിട്ടതിൽ അപജയപ്പെടുകയും ചെയ്തുകഴിഞ്ഞു. അതിനുശേഷം പുതിയ കാര്യങ്ങൾ ഒന്നുപറയാതെ ഞാൻ ഇതേ പ്രമേയം ഇവിടെ കൊണ്ടുവന്നതു തെറ്റാണെന്നു ഏന്റെ മാനുസ്സേഫിതന്മാരിൽ ചിലർ പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. ഒരു രോഗം ചികത്സിക്കുന്നതിനു വൈദ്യന്റെ അടുക്കൽ പോയി ഔഷധം വാങ്ങി ഉപയോഗിച്ചു യാതൊരു സുഖവും ഉണ്ടായില്ല. കുറെ നാൾ കഴിഞ്ഞു വീണ്ടും ചെല്ലുമ്പോൾ ഇതേ രോഗം തന്നെയാണല്ലോ, പുത്തനായി രോഗമെന്നു മില്ലല്ലോ. മടങ്ങിപ്പോയ കൊള്ള. എന്നു പറയുന്നതു പോലെയാണ് ഇത്. ഫിറീപാസ് നിർത്തണമെന്നും അതുനിമിത്തം ജനങ്ങൾ വളരെ സങ്കടം അനുഭവിക്കുന്നുണ്ടെന്നും അതിനു പരിഹാരം ഉണ്ടാകാത്തതാണെന്നും ആണ് ഞാൻ ഇവിടെ ഇതിനു മുമ്പു പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുള്ളതും ഇപ്പോഴും പറയുന്നതും.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): ജനങ്ങൾ സങ്കടം അനുഭവിക്കുന്നുണ്ടെന്നുള്ളതിന് ഏതെങ്കിലും ദൃഷ്ടാന്തം എടുത്തു പറയാനുണ്ടോ?

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ധാരാളം ഉണ്ട്. പറയാം. ആദ്യം ഞാൻ ഇതു കൌൺസിലിന്റെ ശ്രദ്ധയിൽ കൊണ്ടുവന്നപ്പോൾ അതിലേക്കു ഒരു കമ്മിറ്റിയെ ഏർപ്പെടുത്തി. അതിലേക്കു ചില വ്യവസ്ഥകൾ ഉണ്ടാക്കി. ആ വ്യവസ്ഥ പുറംപ്രാധികം സങ്കടകരമായതുകൊണ്ടു സങ്കടത്തിന് പരിഹാരം ഉണ്ടാക്കുന്നതിന് പര്യാപ്തമായില്ല. ആ രോഗം വീണ്ടും ഇതേനിലയിൽ തന്നെ സ്ഥിതിചെയ്യുന്നു.

MR. KURANDIPALLIL R. RAMAN PILLAI (*Quilon*): രോഗം വളർച്ച വരുന്നോ കുറഞ്ഞുവരുന്നോ?

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): സുഖം ഇല്ലാത്തതുകൊണ്ടു വളർക്കുന്നു എന്നല്ലേ പറയേണ്ടതു്? ഔഷധം പറ്റാതെയാണല്ലോ വരുന്നത് അതുകൊണ്ടു പുത്തനായിട്ടു പറയാൻ ഒന്നുമില്ല. ഫീസ് സംബന്ധിച്ചുള്ള കാര്യം മാത്രമേയുള്ളൂ.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): ജനങ്ങൾക്കുണ്ടായിരിക്കാണ്ടിരിക്കുന്ന സങ്കടങ്ങളെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു മെമ്പർക്കു കൂടുതൽ വിവരം പറയാൻ സാധിക്കുമോ?

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ധാരാളം പറയാൻ സാധിക്കും. ഞാൻ പറയുന്നുണ്ട്. ഈ സിസ്റ്റം മറ്റു രാജ്യങ്ങളിലും ഉണ്ടെന്നു കൺസർവേറർ പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. എന്നാൽ എന്റെ അറിവിൽ പെട്ടിടത്തോളം അങ്ങിനെയില്ല. ഞാൻ ബ്രിട്ടീഷ് മലബാറിലും, കണ്ണാടക ജില്ലയിലും തിരുനൽവേലിയിലും പോയി നോക്കിട്ടുണ്ട്.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Torvala*): അവിടെ ഉൾനാടുകളിൽ പോയിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ഉണ്ട്. അവിടെ ഒന്നും ഈമാതിരി വ്യവസ്ഥയില്ല. മംഗലാപുരത്തു തന്നെയും ഇല്ല. ഞാൻ അവിടെ എന്റെ ഒരു സ്റ്റേറീറ്റൻസായി താമസിച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരുന്നപ്പോൾ ആ പുരയിടത്തിലുള്ള വൃക്ഷം അടുത്തു ഒരു സ്ഥലത്തേക്കുകൊണ്ടുപോകുന്നതുകണ്ടു. പാസ് വേണ്ടെന്നു ചോദിച്ചതിന് അവിടെ അങ്ങിനെ ഒരു ചട്ടമില്ലെന്നു അവർ പറഞ്ഞു. കൌൺസിലിൽ ഇങ്ങനെ ഒരേർപ്പാടില്ല. അവിടെയും ധാരാളം റിസ

[Mr. Tariatu Kunjitomman.]

ർവുണ്ട്. ഇങ്ങനെയുള്ള പാസ്സിസ്സം എവിടെയെങ്കിലും ഉള്ളതായി കൺസർവ്വേറ്റർ ഒന്നു വായിച്ചുകേട്ടാൽ കൊള്ളാം. അന്യരാജ്യങ്ങളിലേക്കു കടത്തിക്കൊണ്ടുപോകുന്നതിനു പാസോ ലൈസൻസോ മറ്റോ വേണമെന്നുള്ളതു സമ്മതിക്കാം. എന്നാൽ ഒരു പുരയിടത്തിൽനിന്നും വൃക്ഷം മുറിച്ചു മറ്റൊരു പുരയിടത്തിൽ കൊണ്ടുപോകുന്നതിനു ഫാറസ്റ്റ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റുകാരുടെ പാസ് വേണമെന്നുള്ള ചട്ടം ഒരു സ്ഥലത്തുമില്ല.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): കൊച്ചിയിലുണ്ടോ?

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ഇല്ല. കേരളത്തിൽ മറുപലഭാഗത്തും വൃക്ഷങ്ങളും റിസർവ്വേഷനുകളുണ്ട്. അവിടെയില്ലാത്ത ഒരു ചട്ടം ജനങ്ങളുടെ സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യത്തെ ഭംജിക്കുന്നതിനായി വച്ചിരിക്കുന്നത് എന്തു കഷ്ടമാണ്!

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): നാട്ടുമാരങ്ങൾ മുഴുവനും ഒഴിവാക്കിയില്ലേ?

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): വേങ്ങ, ആഞ്ഞിലി, പ്ലാവു മുതലായവൃക്ഷങ്ങൾ ഒഴിവാക്കിയിട്ടുണ്ട്.

MR. C. P. TARAKAN (*Kunnathnad*): ആഞ്ഞിലിവനത്തിലും ഉണ്ടാകാറില്ലേ?

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ധാരാളം ഉണ്ട്. അതുകൊണ്ടു പ്രയോജനമില്ല. അതിലെ പ്രായോഗികമായ ഭോഷത്തെ സ്വല്പം ഇവിടെ വിവരിക്കാം. കട്ടമംഗലംപകുതിയിൽ സർവ്വെ നമ്പർ-ൽ നിന്നും ഏതാനും മരുതുരുടി മുറിച്ചുവെച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. കെ. മാത്യു എന്നയാൾ പാസിനപേക്ഷിച്ചു. കഴിഞ്ഞ മിഥുനമാസത്തിൽ ആണ് അപേക്ഷിച്ചത്. കാലവർഷക്കാലമായതുകൊണ്ട് ആ നറിൽ കൂടി ഒഴുക്കിക്കൊണ്ടുപോകാമെന്നുവിചാരിച്ചു. പാസുകിട്ടിയില്ല. ഇതാവെറുതേകിക്കുന്നു. അടുത്ത കാലവർഷം വരുമ്പോൾ ഈ തടി ഭൂരിച്ചുപോകയും ചെയ്യും. അതേ പകുതിയിൽത്തന്നെ സർവ്വെ നമ്പർ-ൽ നിന്നു തടി വെട്ടിക്കൊണ്ടുവരുന്നതിനു പലരും പാസ് അപേക്ഷിച്ചു. പാസ് കിട്ടാതെ കഷ്ടപ്പെടുന്നു. കഴിഞ്ഞ മിഥുനത്തിൽ ഒരാളിന്റെ ഭവനം തീകുത്തിപ്പോയി. ആ ഭവനം ഉടമസ്ഥൻ ദേവികളത്തു ഒരു തോട്ടത്തിൽ വേലയ്ക്കുപോയിരിയ്ക്കുകയാണ്. സ്രീകൾ മാത്രമേയുള്ളൂ. ഭവനം ഉടനെതന്നെ കെട്ടേണ്ടിയിരുന്നു. ഓരോ പെൺമനുഷ്യരുടെ അടുക്കൽ

നിന്നും പണം പിരിച്ചു. എന്റെ അടുക്കലും വന്നു. ഞാൻ ൫ രൂപ കൊടുത്തു. അവർ രണ്ടുതടി തരികയാണെങ്കിൽ വളരെ ഉപകാരമായിരിക്കുമെന്നു പറഞ്ഞു. പാസ്സില്ലാതെ ഞാൻ തടി തരികയില്ല എന്നു പറഞ്ഞു തടി കൊടുത്തില്ല.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (Tovala) : നാട്ടുമരങ്ങളൊന്നുമില്ലായിരുന്നോ?

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha) : കേരളത്തിൽ നാട്ടുമരവും കാട്ടുമരവും രണ്ടായിട്ടു വേർതിരിക്കാൻ സാധിക്കുകയില്ല. ഇവിടെ എല്ലാത്തരം വൃക്ഷങ്ങളും പിടിക്കും. യൂറോപ്പിലുണ്ടാകുന്ന വൃക്ഷങ്ങൾ ഒരുപക്ഷേ ഇവിടെ ഉണ്ടാവുകയില്ലായിരിക്കാം. ഇത് ഇൻഡ്യയുടെ ആരാമമാണ്. മധുര, തിരുനൽവേലി മുതലായ ജില്ലകളിൽ ചെന്നാൽ ആവണക്കാൺ മഹാമരം. ഇവിടെ അങ്ങിനെയില്ല. ഇവിടത്തെ വൃക്ഷങ്ങളെ മുറിച്ചു കൊടുത്താൽ ഫാറസ്റ്റ് കാർ കേസാക്കി ശിക്ഷിക്കും. ഫാറസ്റ്റ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റുകാരുടെ ഭക്ഷിച്ച മാമുലിനെ പാലിക്കാനുള്ള പ്രതിപത്തുകൊണ്ടു ഇവിടെ പ്രകൃതി വിഭവങ്ങളെ ഉപയോഗിക്കാൻ തരമില്ലാതിരിക്കുന്നു. ഇവിടത്തെ തടിവിദേശികൾക്കു മിതമായ വിലക്കു കിട്ടുന്നുണ്ടു. സമുദ്രതീരങ്ങളിൽ കൃബിക്കടിക്കുവു അണ നു അണ ഉള്ള തടി മലയോരങ്ങളിൽ ചുട്ടി രൂപം കൊടുത്തു വാങ്ങിക്കെണ്ടിയിരിക്കുന്നു. മലയോരത്തുള്ള ഒരാൾക്കു ഒരു തടി ഉപയോഗിക്കണമെങ്കിൽ രണ്ടു തടിയുടെ വില കൊടുക്കണം. പ്രീപാസ് റിക്കലും പ്രീപാസല്ല. പ്രീപാസിനു റേഞ്ചർമാർക്കു അപേക്ഷ കൊടുത്താൽ അവടെനിന്നു ഡിവിഷനാഫീസുകൾപോയി വളരെ താമസിച്ച് അയച്ചു കൊടുക്കുന്നത്. എളുപ്പം കിട്ടുന്ന പാസിനുതന്നെ രണ്ടുമാസം ആകും. റേഞ്ചർമാരിൽ ചിലർ യോഗ്യന്മാരായിരിക്കും. ഇവിടെയെല്ലാം പണച്ചിലവുചെയ്യാതെ കാര്യം നടക്കുകയില്ല. ഇതിനെ നിയന്ത്രിക്കുന്നതിനു കൺസർവേറ്റർ വളരെ വൈമനസ്യം കാണിക്കുന്നു. ജനങ്ങൾ എന്തു കഷ്ടത അനുഭവിച്ചാലും കൊള്ളാം ഫാറസ്റ്റ് മുതൽ വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കണം, തന്റെ അധികാരശക്തി വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കണം എന്നാണു കൺസർവേറ്റർ വിചാരിക്കുന്നത്. ഇത്രയെല്ലാം ആയിട്ടും ഫാറസ്റ്റ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റിന്റേക്കു കിട്ടുന്ന ആദായം എന്താണ്? തേക്കുതടിയിൽനിന്നും കിട്ടുന്ന നാലുപക്ഷം രൂപ മാത്രമാണ്. അതും കുടിപുരയിടങ്ങളിലുള്ള തേക്കുതടി നശിച്ചുകഴിഞ്ഞാൽ പിന്നെ ആദായമില്ല. ജനങ്ങളുടെ പുരയിടങ്ങളിൽ ശുദ്ധ പതിക്കാതെ റിസർവിൽതന്നെ ശുദ്ധപതി

[Mr. Tariatu Kunjtomman.]

ചാൽ ഇതിലും കൂടുതലായ ആദായ ഉണ്ടാകുമായിരുന്നു. ജനങ്ങളുടെ സ്വത്തവകാശത്തിനും രക്ഷ ഉണ്ടാകുമായിരുന്നു. മറ്റു പല ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിലും പഴയ മാതൃൽ ദോഷകരമാണെന്നു കണ്ടു അതിനെ മാറ്റിയിരിക്കുന്നു. ഫാറസ്റ്റ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റും ഇനിയും മാറ്റിയിട്ടില്ല. കാട്ടുജന്തുക്കൾ അടുത്തുള്ള വിളവുകളെ നശിപ്പിക്കുന്നു. ഫാറസ്റ്റ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിലെ കീഴ്വോഗസ്ഥന്മാർ കുടികളുടെ സ്വത്തവകാശത്തെ ധ്വംസിക്കുന്നു. ഇങ്ങനെ കാട്ടുജന്തുക്കളും റിസർവ്വ് ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരും ഒരുപോലെ സങ്കടപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുള്ള ഒരു ജനവിഭാഗമാണ് ഈ രാജ്യത്തെ കർഷകന്മാർ. അതുകൊണ്ട് ഇതിനു പരിഹാരം ഈ ജനപ്രതിനിധിസഭയിൽ നിന്നുമല്ലാതെ വേറെ എവിടെനിന്നാണ് ഉണ്ടാക്കേണ്ടത്. ഉറന്നാട്ടിലെ കൃഷിക്കാരുടെ സങ്കടനിവാരണത്തിനുവേണ്ടി കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുള്ള ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ ജനപ്രതിനിധികളായ എന്റെ മാനുസ്ക്രൈഫിതന്മാരെല്ലാം അനുകൂലിക്കണമെന്നു അഭ്യർത്ഥിക്കുന്നു.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunaguzhali*): I am afraid he cannot address the House, Sir.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Can he address the House directly, except through the Chair, Sir?

PRESIDENT: I think he was using a rhetorical form of address to the Chair.

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): Sir, I do not think I have to say much after hearing the arguments on the other side except to say that Mr. Kunjtomman has been as usual exaggerating; and probably his language also lends itself for that purpose. It is now four years since the new rules have been introduced; and Mr. Kunjtomman has had so many opportunities of seeing me both here and elsewhere. But he has never told me anything about these grievances which he has been pointing out in such lurid colours here. I believe I have seen him more often in Trivandrum than elsewhere. He is a gentleman who goes about moving with people and if there was such a real grievance he could have at least told me when he comes here.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): May I know whether the Conservator himself had not been supervising the working of the new rules apart from the representation of Mr. Kunjtomman whom he expects should complain to him of these grievances.

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): I have with me the reports from the Divisional Forest Officers and I have got figures here collected, and from these figures it is seen that, out of 1,083 cases of applications for free passes, 1,071 cases or so have been disposed of, promptly leaving only some 11 cases.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Were they disposed of within the time fixed by the rules?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): Yes, that is my point. Out of these 11 cases there has been a delay only in one case, of three months. That is what the Divisional Forest Officers report and I have certainly got to take them at their word. Mr. Kunjittomman has also been making some general statements regarding the difficulties in obtaining passes. Sir, it is all easy to say so. As a public man it is his duty to bring these difficulties, if any, to the notice of the authorities concerned. He has been saying that a man who applies for the pass has to go through every office from the office of the Ranger and that sorts of things. But I do not know whether I should say much on that. It is quite easy for people to make general statements. But so far as we Government servants are concerned we have to go by certain rules and there is no half way to get over the difficulty.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I really fail to understand what he means by half way?

PRESIDENT: I think the Conservator omitted the word "house".

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): Mr. Sivatanu Pillai was complaining of want of an enabling provision in the rules to obviate cause of delay. That matter came up for discussion before the Committee, when the subject was under consideration. Of course, the majority of the members did not accept a provision of like that, but clause 11 was introduced just to get over the difficulties. Clause 11 reads like this:

"The whole procedure in each case shall be completed within two months from the date of the receipt of the application for the pass. The applicant or the agent not fulfilling the conditions within a reasonable time, it may be rejected, and an endorsement of rejection may be given with the reasons therefor. If the endorsement cannot be given personally to the applicant or his agent it should be sent to him and a note made in the office records."

I just read this to show that there can be no wilful delay on the part of subordinates concerned. It is for that purpose that the rule has been introduced. If in spite of this there is delay it is open to the applicant to prefer a civil suit against the officers or Government and seek a remedy. But till now no cause has arisen.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Torala*): Was there not a notice of suit for damages?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): Yes. He referred to another instance in which the facts of the case were placed before the House in a quite different way. But as the matter is *sub-judice* I would not be justified in going into the details of the case. But I can assure the House that the matter has been fully enquired into on a petition given to me and to Government, and we found that the subordinates concerned were not at all to blame. Of course, the petitioner was informed of the cause of the delay and the matter has now been rectified.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Was there not delay in the office of the D. F. O. after the receipt of the report of the Ranger concerned that there is no objection to issue a pass?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): I am not aware.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Was there not a complaint presented before the Conservator?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): Yes, the complaint was enquired into and decision arrived at.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Was it not disposed of finally after the timber had been sold away?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): Not at all.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Does he know that the timber had already been sold away because the party did not get the pass in time?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): No, Sir, so far as I know, it was for other reasons. My information is as good as Mr. Sivatanu Pillai's; the owner had to sell away the timber for some other reasons.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Was there not a number of cart loads of firewood pending removal when the application was pending and serious complaint preferred to the Conservator of Forests?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): All those facts were enquired into, and orders given to expedite, and there was no further difficulty. He was also informed of the cause of delay.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I know what are the conditions attached to an application if an application has to be granted, except the title deeds of properties?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): All these are given in the rules. It would take much time for me to go into all these things.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Is there any impossible condition except the condition of sending title deeds?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): I think these are details which I cannot go into.

Another suggestion made by some of the members on the other side was that if there was no difficulty in eliminating some of the rules from operation it may be done. I think it was Mr. Kumara Pillai who suggested, that no passes need be insisted upon in the matter of transporting timber in low countries. The difficulty that we have here is that it is during flood time most of the timber is removed from the forests. Then one has only to move the rafts into the water, and the next day it will be in the low country. In cases of this kind we have to insist that passes should be obtained previously.

MR. C. P. TARAKAN (*Kunnatnad*): തടി വനത്തിൽനിന്നും വെട്ടി ശേഖരിച്ചശേഷമല്ലെ വെള്ളപ്പൊക്ക കാലത്തു ഇറക്കിക്കൊണ്ടുപോകാൻ സാധിക്കുകയുള്ളൂ?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): When people remove timber illicitly they do not collect logs previously. They go in batches one night and the next morning the logs are in the low country.

MR. C. P. TARAKAN (*Kunnatnad*): ഒരു രാത്രികൊണ്ടു് അത്ര വളരെ തടികൊണ്ടുപോകാൻ സാധിക്കുമോ?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): We see from our experience that it is quite possible for a man bent upon smuggling timber. Another suggestion made was to remove the watch stations into the interior of the Forests. We have been doing this as far as possible. Recently we abolished the station at Vattapara.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*T'ovala*): How is the free pass system going to prevent smuggling during the time of flood?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): When the logs are found in low country and if there is a system of obtaining passes you can just ask the man to produce it, and you can then know whether the timber is legally or illegally obtained.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*T'ovala*): Cannot the man be asked to show the stem of the tree which he felled?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): The timber may not be on the land and if we launch a prosecution the Magistrate may say that the onus of proof is on Government. The timber may be at Alleppey and how can you insist upon the man showing the stem. As far as watch stations are concerned we are trying to take them to the interior of the forest wherever possible. There was a watch station somewhere near Kalial and this has also been done away with. Wherever we find that these stations are not necessary we are abolishing them. Generally, watch stations are located in places where one or more roads or streams meet, and so it is not always possible to shift these stations.

MR. C. P. THOMAS (*Nominated*): May I know whether I was right in thinking that certain areas were excluded from the operation of these rules?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): Mr. Thomas has been evidently confusing the thing. Last time in connection with the royalty committee report I had stated we had divided the whole State into three divisions.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Is there any objection to put in an enabling provision permitting the owner to remove the timber without pass when there is delay in getting it?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): There is Section 4.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): That is something else. I ask if there is any delay on the part of the Forest Department in granting passes, has he got any objection to the owner removing the timber?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): Certainly. There is very serious objection. In spite of all facilities afforded by the department, if the applicant is not satisfied with the reasons given for refusal there is the Civil Court where he can seek his remedy.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I know whether any applicant not having been satisfied with the reasons given for refusal has sued Government and has been able to obtain remedy through Civil Court? Is it not better to prosecute him under the various Regulations instead of driving him to the Civil Courts against the Department?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): Here no question of prosecution comes in. It is only the question of refusing or not refusing pass.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): What I ask is instead of driving him to a Court of Law to proceed against the Departmental Officers concerned for damages, is it not better to prosecute him if he offends against rules.

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): We don't give him pass, and without pass he cannot transport, and so no question of prosecution comes in.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): If there is delay on the part of the Department what is the remedy?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): The remedy is by way of complaint against the Departmental officer concerned. The cause for refusal of the pass is made known to the applicant and if it is possible to remedy the defect he has only to do it, and apply again and then a pass will be given. On the other hand if he does not remedy the defects and if he is not satisfied with the decision of the Department, he may go to the Civil Courts for remedy.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Does he know that, before a public servant can be sued he has to be served with a notice?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): May be.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Does he know what the period for such notice is?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): I am not quite sure.

Some of the members on the other side of the House pointed out that the rules as they stand are applicable throughout the State and there are certain taluks where there are no bamboos, or timber for example, Amblapuzha. One gentleman assured the House that there was no bamboo in Shertallai. Of course we admit these are cases where the rules, as they stand, will operate hardship if we insist upon them. But we do not insist upon the production of passes in these places. There are not even Forest subordinates in some of these places. I have not myself seen what Shertallai is like.

MR. C. P. TARAKAN (*Kunnathnad*): ഈ രൂപം ഭേദപ്പെടുത്താതിരിക്കുന്നിടത്തോളംകാലം ഗവർണ്മെന്റിൽനിന്നും Insist ചെയ്യാതിരിക്കുന്നതു ശരിയാണോ?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): That is what I am saying. In cases like this where the rules are likely to operate hardship, I have no objection to making provision and recommending to Government the exemption of some of these taluks. If that is the real difficulty some of the members are having, I think I will have to address Government in regard to that.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): What does he say in regard to Mr. Kunjitomman's challenge as to the non-existence of such rules on British Malabar and Cochin?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): Unfortunately I have not got those rules here. I do not know much about Cochin. But I know there are transport rules in the Malabar District.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Has it any reference to the free pass rules?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): Yes, one should have a pass for transporting timber there.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): From private lands?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): I do not know whether it is from private lands or otherwise?

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): That is our point. Is there any free pass rule identical with ours, in British Malabar?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): There are certain transport rules and they are applicable to both private and Government timber.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Have the transport rules in British Malabar or Cochin or Mysore, referred to by the Conservator of Forests, any reference to the free pass rules that we have here; that is to say, is there any rule in those places similar to our free pass rules insisting upon a pass to remove timber even from one's own land or from that of his neighbour?

(Since the Conservator of Forests did not, for a few minutes, rise up in his seat to answer the question Mr. Sivatanu Pillai said:)

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I know, Sir, whether he proposes to answer the question?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): The first volume alone is here and I do not find the transport rules in it.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I know whether the Conservator is prepared to say that they have, in British Malabar and Coimbatore, rules similar to the free pass rules that obtain here?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): Whether the timber is from private land or private forest or from Government land or Government forest, their transport is governed by a set of rules known as the transport rules.

PRESIDENT: That is not the point. What Mr. Sivatanu Pillai asks is whether, in Coimbatore, Malabar and Cochin there are rules similar to the free pass rules in Travancore.

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): That, I do not know, unless I write and ask for the information.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ഒരു പുരയിടത്തിൽനിന്നും അടുത്ത പുരയിടത്തിൽ കൊണ്ടുപോകുന്നതിനു ഫാറസ്സ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റുകാരുടെ പാസ്സ് വേണമെന്ന് ഇൻഡ്യയിൽ ഏതെങ്കിലും ഭാഗത്തുള്ളതായി കൺസർവേറ്റർ വായിച്ചുകേട്ടാൽ കൊള്ളാം.

PRESIDENT: The Conservator has resumed his seat.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): ചോദ്യം ഇല്ലെന്നു അറിഞ്ഞതിനുശേഷം മാത്രമേ ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥ മെമ്പർമാർ ഇരിക്കാവൂ എന്ന് ഒരു ആർഡർവച്ചാൽ കൊള്ളാം. (*Laughter.*)

PRESIDENT: Have you concluded your speech, Mr. Dhanukoti Pillai?

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI (*Conservator of Forests*): Yes, Sir.

The resolution was put to the vote of the House and declared lost.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha cum Todupuzha*): പോൾ എടുത്താൽ കൊള്ളാം.

A poll was taken and the House divided as follows:—

AYES—10.

1. Mr A. J. John	6. Mr. M. N. Pillai
2. „ K. I. Joseph	7. „ G. Raman Menon
3. „ Tariatu Kunjitomman	8. „ M. Sivatanu Pillai
4. „ K. Madhavan Pillai.	9. „ C. P. Tarakan
5. „ K. G. Mammen	10. „ C. P. Thomas
Mappillai.	

NOES—28.

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. I. C. Chacko | 14. Mr. Paul Daniel |
| 2. „ R. Dhanukoti Pillai | 15. „ C. Kerala Varma Koil |
| 3. „ K. George | Tampuran |
| 4. „ P. Gomatinayagom Pillai | 16. „ C. P. Kochukunju Pillai |
| 5. „ P. N. Krishna Pillai | 17. „ N. K. Krishna Pillai |
| 6. Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai | 18. „ T. Kumara Pillai |
| 7. Mr. N. Nilakanta Pillai | 19. „ L. A. Lampard |
| 8. „ Kayalam Paramesvaran Pillai | 20. „ Kallur Narayana Pillai |
| 9. Mrs. M. Poonen Lukose | 21. „ K. P. Nilakanta Pillai |
| 10. Mr. K. N. Ramasubba Aiyar | 22. „ R. Padmanabhan |
| 11. Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar | 23. „ A. K. Pillai |
| 12. Mr. S. C. H. Robinson | 24. „ S. Piraviperumal Pillai |
| 13. „ A. Vipin | 25. „ R. Raman Pillai |
| | 26. „ K. Sivarama Panikkar |
| | 27. „ V. Subba Aiyar |
| | 28. „ M. Subrahmanya Pillai |

NEUTRALS—3.

- | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. P. Habeeb Mahomed | 3. Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai |
| 2. „ C. V. Kunjuraman | |

The following resolution was not moved:

BUILDING AND EQUIPMENT GRANTS.

“MR. A. J. JOHN: This Council recommends to the Government that the policy of refusing grant-in-aid for building and equipment necessary for securing recognition for educational institutions be given up and that grant be given for expenditure on such building and equipment, provided that the grant be disbursed only after recognition has been granted.”

PRICES OF VERNACULAR TEXT-BOOKS.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): Sir, I beg to move the following resolution:

“This Council recommends to the Government that the total price of the Vernacular text books, excluding grammar, prescribed may not exceed the amounts shown below for each class or form:

Preparatory class	...	Chs. 14
Form I	...	Chs. 17-8 cash
Form II	...	Chs. 21
Form III	...	Chs. 24-8 cash
Form IV	...	Re. 1
Form V	...	Re. 1 Chs. 3-8 cash
Form VI	...	Re. 1 Chs. 7
Class V	...	Chs. 18
Class VI	...	Chs. 22
Class VII	...	Chs. 26
Class VIII	...	Re. 1 Chs. 2
Class IX	...	Re. 1 Chs. 6

[Mr. G. Raman Menon.]

When considering the subject matter of this resolution, I am reminded of a witty saying made, I believe, by my friend Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai. It was more or less to this effect: 'Authors, publishers, booksellers, editors of newspapers, members of the text-book committee, the educational and other Government officers make a great fuss about the prescription of text-books. The interested parties among them engage in a very spirited competitive trial of skill in compassing their respective wishes. But, unfortunately, the poor heads of school pupils eventually form the butt or aim of all these powerful persons'. I am not quite certain whether my friend made the remark before or after he became a member of the Text-Book Committee. I am quite sure that he will not forget the above remark of his during his work as a member of the Text-Book Committee, if he is a member at present.

I am sorry, Sir, that the poor heads of the school-pupils suffer in a most pitiable manner from the missiles aimed at them from different quarters. The pockets of their guardians also suffer from the attacks of the licensed pick-pockets let loose on them by the authorities concerned.

There are various points to be considered in the matter of the prescription of text-books. The present resolution confines itself directly to one aspect of it, *viz.*, the prices of Vernacular Text-Books prescribed for each class or form. If the resolution is given effect to by the Government, it will indirectly at least help to relieve the sufferings of the poor heads of school-pupils as well. If the total price of the Vernacular Text-Books for each class is limited to a reasonable figure the number of missiles in the shape of text-books, which eventually find a lodging in the heads of school pupils, will appreciably decrease.

I sent up this resolution along with a number of others in regard to the selection of text-books long ago and at that time I examined the prices of the Vernacular Text-Books prescribed for each class or form. I found that the prices were from three to four times the amount which I have suggested in the resolution—sometimes even 6 or 7 times. It seems to me that in the Preparatory class, only about 40 or 50 pages of Vernacular literature can be taught during the course of one school year. As a fact no more is taught or even read. There are so many other things also to be taught. If for the benefit of these 40 or 50 small pages of ordinary print conveying very ordinary matter of doubtful advantage, a price of a Rupee and a half or more is to be paid, that is a thing which requires immediate mending. For obliging 3 or 4 book-sellers or authors, 3 or 4 books are prescribed for each class. Each book though it may contain only about 30, 40, or 50 pages, is priced at 8 Chs. or 10 Chs. per copy. The school authorities compel the pupils to buy all the books together at the beginning of the school year and make a pretence of teaching portions from all the books at different periods during the same week. At the end of the year, only 8 or 10 pages from each book will have been taught. In the lower classes, the examination can be confined to the portions really taught.

But in the classes for which there are public examinations a pretence is made that all the portions prescribed have been taught and examinations are held accordingly. In the case of the pupils of the highest classes, a teaching of the perfunctory sort may be sufficient in the matter of Vernacular text-books, as they are in the mother tongue of the pupils or in a language familiar to them. In the case of the pupils of the lower classes, such teaching is not sufficient.

There is absolutely no justification for compelling pupils to buy more text books or more pages of text-books than they can study during the course of the year. The price charged for Vernacular Text-books especially for those which have a sale of 3 or 4 thousand copies at least need only be at the rate of about 1 chackram for 8 *de i octavo* pages. The prices of books of other size also need only correspond to the above. In the courses of instruction prescribed for schools, the number of pages of prose and poetry to be taught are definitely indicated. If the size of books prescribed is confined to that number or even to twice or thrice the size, the prices indicated in the resolution will be more than sufficient for the books to be prescribed. I found that the total price of all the Malayalam books prescribed for the second form at present, excluding grammar, is Re. 1-Chs. 26.

For the III Form	Re. 1-Chs. 24.
„ IV Form	Rs. 3-Chs. 6.
„ V Form	Rs. 6-1-10.
„ VI Form	Rs. 5-Chs. 7-2 cash.

In the V, VI and VII classes the prices are not so very inordinate since the text books published by the Government have been introduced.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): May I know whether, in his calculation, the member includes Mr. Raja Raja Varma's grammar also? I do not think he will get this figure unless he includes grammar also?

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*) *Excluding* grammar; I have stated that already. It will be more if we include grammar.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): I question the accuracy of the statement, Sir.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): I fear the figures indicated in my resolution are too high. That is why I have said only that those prices should not be exceeded. In practice, the prices can very well be fixed below the maxima indicated in the resolution. But the present prices are twice or thrice those indicated in the resolution. It is for this reason that I have put the maxima unduly high for the present so as to make a moderate beginning. My resolution only errs on the side of moderation. I shall be very glad if the Government are ready to carry out the spirit of the resolution to a greater extent even from the very start.

[Mr. G. Raman Menon]

Before concluding, I wish to make a friendly appeal to some of the members, mainly official, not to say that the prescription of text books rests with the Text-Book Committee and the Director of Education. Yesterday some statements of that nature were made, such as the one to the effect that the fact that no private persons are applying to Government for license to cultivate tobacco shows that there are no facilities for such cultivation in this country. When statements of that kind are made, I am reminded of what Mr. Subba Aiyar, our esteemed Deputy President, said when he was speaking about Mr. Padmanabhan's Ezhava Regulation Amending Bill. It was to this effect:—"When hearing some of the speeches, I was feeling as if we are being carried away in an aeroplane to some other country altogether and we are not in our beloved Travancore which we all know so very well".

That is exactly what I too have to say regarding certain statements based merely on the written rules or other records, and not on the practical working about which we are all so familiar.

We all know very well that most of the members of the Text-Book Committee and the Director of Public Instruction are mere tools in the hands of the Government and that the powers that be very often interfere with the prescription of text books. I know from the doings of the Text-Book Committee some years ago that interference by the Government may sometimes be quite legitimate and in the interests of the public. The reverse may also be the case on other occasions. As the details are not laid before the public I am not at present able to apportion praise or blame between the Text-Book Committee, the Director of Public Instruction and the Government.

What I submit is that in the eyes of the public the Government are the responsible party under the circumstances as the other authorities are creatures of the Government.

PRESIDENT: What has all this got to do with the fixing of the prices of the readers?

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): Prices are dependent upon the number and the nature of the books prescribed.

We can say very little about the action of the members of the Text-Book Committee as neither the proceedings of the Text-Book Committee nor even the final list of text books prescribed by them is published.

PRESIDENT: You want to fix the price of text-books. The price of books is the only thing that interests you and not the contents of the book.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): So if the Government say that they are not to blame for the present state of affairs in regard to the text-books, that will be something like the thief

who pretended when he was discovered tumbling down from the roof of a house, that he had just descended from heaven and exclaimed “ഇതുതാനെ ഭൂലോകം!”

So my request is that our discussions should, as far as possible, be based on the actualities as they exist at present in Travancore and not merely on what is found in public records or what ought to be.

This is by the way. I am quite sure that the subject matter of the present resolution stands in urgent need of the action of the Government and the subject cannot be shoved on to the shoulders of any lesser authority. I request that the resolution may be accepted by the House and the Government.

MR. KURANDIPALLIL R. RAMAN PILLAI (*Quilon*): I second the resolution.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): Sir, when I saw that the resolution just now moved was to be moved by Mr. Raman Menon I expected a more formidable case to be made out than that which we have now listened to. After hearing it, I began to feel that my genial friend Mr. Raman Menon must have got up today on the wrong side of his bed. It is difficult otherwise to account for the excessive and unjustifiable asperity of his criticisms. He has been so unnecessarily and unfairly caustic in his remarks and so free in his distribution of blame among the various parties, whom he supposes to be responsible for acts regarded by him as ‘monstrous’ acts, whether such parties be the Government or the various subordinate agencies of the Government. He has chosen to refer to such authors as are fortunate to get books prescribed as text-books as “veritable pick-pockets”! He expressed the apprehension that the Government would try to shield itself against such criticisms by pleading that it could not be held to blame for the acts of its subordinates. He has concluded his allocution by a very ingenious interpretation of our ‘Constitution’. Coming as it does from the author of a book on the ‘Administration of Travancore’, now recommended for study in our Vernacular Schools, by the very body whose work Mr. Raman Menon condemns vehemently, this exposition of the constitution must have filled us all with amazement.

I do not feel, however, that I would be justified in following Mr. Raman Menon in these excursions. I shall face squarely the question which he has raised. As a member of the House reminded us in the course of another discussion held today, we are rich in rumours of the enormous profits made by persons in various vague and undescribed ways. We all know that there is a wide spread belief that such big fortunes are supposed to have been made by those who have written text books. The Vernacular Text-Book Committee which was the object of Mr. Raman Menon’s attack has been long accustomed at certain seasons of the year to receive a great deal of blame from both the platform and the press for its decisions. Considerable fortunes have been alleged to have been made by the authors of Vernacular Text-

[Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswamy Aiyangar.]

Books. The Vernacular Text-Book Committee and the other authorities concerned in the selection of text-books are all supposed to have been influenced in esoteric and un reputable ways in regard to such prescriptions, resulting in the building up of big fortunes at the expense of the unlucky students.

I must confess, Sir, that I have not yet found any one, who has written Vernacular Books, and has made a fortune by his publications at least not in the recent past. If anybody has made or could have made such a fortune by the selection of his book as a Vernacular Text-Book, Mr. Raman Menon as an author favoured by the Text-Book Committee, must be in a position to give us some indication of the large profits that can be made in such a way, from his own experience, for, he is himself one of the happy few who are among the elect authors whose books are and have been prescribed for study in our schools.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): What about Mr. Thomas Paul and the proprietor of the B. V. Book Depot?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): I am speaking of authors not publishers. I do not know whether the persons referred to by Mr. K. P. Nilakanta Pillai have or have not made fortunes by publishing Vernacular Books which are prescribed as text books. Publishers like other business men sometimes make profits, sometimes make gains and sometimes incur losses. In all going concerns it is very difficult to state whether profits are being piled up or not. However I feel I am on safe ground in stating that the estimate of the profits of such publishers must be pure guess-work. I do not think even our Vakil friends on the other side would be able to obtain from such business-men any accounts of their business losses and gains except perhaps in the course of judicial proceedings.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): If we look into their accounts?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): I am greatly impressed by hearing this, since it shows what a touching faith Mr. Nilakanta Pillai has in accounts produced as evidence. However, Sir, it is all beside the point. As I have said at the outset, my concern is to face the question raised by Mr. Raman Menon squarely. He has lamented that, though he has tabled this resolution, he has done so as part of a wide plan in which he would have brought out other aspects of this profiteering for discussion before this House. He has referred to this in such a way as to suggest that even his instalment of criticism is only small when compared to the volume of just criticism to which Government could be exposed, if he brought up other connected questions also for discussion. I do not think, Sir, that the authorities responsible for the prescription of text-books would have much to fear even if Mr. Raman Menon carries out his threat and brings up all these questions together for examination in this House.

At the outset, I might perhaps be allowed to say that if I oppose this resolution I do so absolutely and in a disinterested manner. I am not connected in any way with the Vernacular Text-Book Committee; and I am not concerned with the prescription of any of these books. On the other hand, I am one of those unhappy victims, namely, guardians, whose deplorable position under the system of profiteering authors, Mr. Raman Menon has painted in such gloomy colours! I happen to be responsible for the education of a number of children, some being my own and some being those of my relations. Considering that I have got to pay for their education all-round, and for their text-books, I must be penalised even more than the type of parent or guardian whose sorrows Mr. Raman Menon has painted. Apart from these I am myself a schoolmaster with a large school under me. I can therefore claim to know something of what is taking place in our schools, in the teaching of text-books prescribed and in the handling of such books. From such experience and personal knowledge I must be allowed to state categorically that Mr. Raman Menon has been grossly exaggerating and has not given a correct or a true picture of the manner in which the Vernacular text-books are used in our schools. It is true I do not know all our schools but the one under me is a fair sample of the others. I must therefore say in fairness to my brethren who are teachers in such schools—the members of the fraternity of which Mr. Raman Menon himself was once upon a time a useful member—that they are not accustomed, as alleged by Mr. Raman Menon, to slur over the teaching of the prescribed text-books and to cover only a small portion of the text-books so prescribed during the entire school year, leaving the greater part of such books unfinished. Such grossly casual methods of dealing with their class work cannot be ascribed to our teachers, nor am I prepared to admit that our inspecting officers are so dead to their responsibility and so lacking in vigilance as to allow such a fraud upon education to be systematically practised in all our schools. It is not merely a case of Mr. Raman Menon's exaggerating the extent of an existing evil. I do not believe that there is such an evil, and that the condition described by Mr. Raman Menon is an *actual* condition. I can think, however, of a possible case of Mr. Raman Menon's diatribe against the manner in which, according to his belief, the teaching of the prescribed text-books is neglected wholesale in our schools. It is this. Mr. Raman Menon apparently is unable to comprehend the difference between two kinds of text-books prescribed now-a-days in all our classes, each of which is dealt with in a different way in the classes. One of these kinds is prescribed for detailed study and the books so prescribed are referred to as "detailed text-books." They are not numerous and their volume is not considerable. They are generally composed of selections from classical writers, and an intensive study of their matter and language is insisted on on the part of the students. Consequently, these detailed text-books have to be covered from beginning to end in as a great detail as possible, and it is impossible for teachers to slur over their contents in the course of class teaching or to leave large parts of them untouched. A school teacher who

[Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.]

fails to cover the whole portion allotted for a particular year, for detailed study, without proper justification will come to grief pretty quickly if his headmaster or his Inspector knew of his dereliction. I am sure that our headmasters and Inspectors are quite alive to their duties as much as their subordinates and that they would hardly permit teachers to neglect their work, in the gross manner suggested by Mr. Raman Menon. It is impossible even for individual teachers to neglect with impunity the teaching of detailed text-books in such a manner. It is therefore certain that such a wholesale neglect cannot be ascribed to all our teachers. It is up to the headmasters who are present in this House today to tell the House whether this sweeping and damaging generalisation and condemnation made by Mr. Raman Menon in regard to the handling of the Vernacular text-books in our schools has any justification whatever in those schools of which they have knowledge but of which I have no direct knowledge.

The other kind of text-books is classed as 'non-detailed' text-books. The aim in prescribing books for non-detailed reading is that they should be read by the pupils alone, with the minimum of assistance from the teachers, and that they should not be taught in the schools. In order that this aspect might be quite clear, non-detailed text-books are referred to in our curricula and list of prescriptions as 'home reading' books. The object in prescribing them is to train our pupils in the habits of reading and study and to cultivate their taste for reading. If this aim is properly understood there would be no difficulty in understanding the justification for the prescription of such non-detailed home reading books. Undoubtedly the inclusion of such books in the list of prescriptions tends to swell the number of the books prescribed and also their cost. But this is inevitable if we are to keep abreast of the march of educational knowledge. I may say in this context that one of the chief differences between the principles followed in the prescription of text-books 20 or 30 years ago, in the days when Mr. Raman Menon and I were students, and the principles followed in the prescription of text-books at the present day is to be found in the increasing emphasis laid now-a-days upon this non-detailed study. The great idea now-a-days is not to overload the list of prescribed books by including a large number of books whose matter has to be covered intensively. We now strive to prescribe a sufficient amount of reading matter which a student might be well expected to cover by his own un-aided effort supplemented by such occasional help as a school teacher could give. Our object now is to provide the facilities which will enable students to cultivate habits of wide reading, that is, to cultivate both the passion and the habit of wide study, and to create in our pupils a real love for literature. We do not regard students as reservoirs into which a certain amount of information has to be pumped by the teacher. The student is not only a partner in his own education but is an even more important agent in his education than the teacher or the text-book; and it is by cultivating his habits of unassisted study by the prescription of 'non-detailed'

text-books, that we shall achieve this great educational aim. I say, therefore, that the prescription of 'non-detailed' text-books or 'home reading' books for every one of our classes, such prescription as is now made by the Vernacular Text-Book Committee and the English Text-Book Committee, is perfectly in consonance with modern ideals of teaching and with the present day notion that we should regard the educator not as one who fills a student with information but as one who watches the student's progress and guides him so as to allow him to grow as far as possible spontaneously and by himself. This is the ideal. It is in harmony with this ideal that, I repeat, a differentiation has to be made between detailed and non-detailed text-books and that both have to be prescribed for our classes. I must refer to a change in the angle of vision in regard to the character of the books prescribed and to the quantity. We now prescribe more books than we used to do in the past, because formerly we prescribed all books for detailed study whereas now we prescribe books both for detailed and non-detailed study to be completed within about the same time as before. We also prescribe more prose than verse because prose is more important than verse for the ordinary purposes in life. People for example do not habitually speak or write in verse while they do so in prose. We also endeavour as far as possible to set for study modern prose and modern verse, that is, prose and verse in living modern language, in preference to older classical verse, which used to monopolise our text-books once upon a time. What I have now asserted is true not only of our Vernacular prescriptions but also of the prescriptions for the study of English in our schools.

These are, Sir, briefly the principles upon which our books *ought* to be prescribed and *are* prescribed. Other aims which the Text-Book Committees should have and actually have in view are to select only books of right quality and of right quantity, judged by the amount which an average student would be able to cover in a normal school year without any abnormal extension or contraction. If an excessive quantity of reading matter is prescribed the prescribed number of books is simply not covered through. This has to be avoided. All these aims are before our Text-Book Committees and they cannot afford to ignore or forget them. The work of our committees has to be done in the fierce glare of public criticism. Our Text-Book Committee members are not only not immune from public criticism, but they naturally attract more of it than other public workers. The nature of their work makes them get a considerable amount of criticism from the Press, the platform and public Assemblies and they get it both as individuals and collectively as Committees. They are also exposed to the criticism of inspecting officers and of the Head of the Education Department. If such criticisms attract the attention of the Government, the Government also asks inconvenient questions. Consequently our Text-Book Committees have to be ever vigilant and to be perpetually on the defence in regard to the prescription of text-books. If Mr. Raman Menon's charge that so many books are prescribed for each class now-a-days in the vernacular that the matter prescribed cannot all be covered within the school year and that

[Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.]

not even a small fraction of the matter prescribed is ever covered during the school year, if his charge is really well founded, I maintain that it would not have been left to him alone to draw our attention to it. We should have heard of this complaint long ago and from many quarters. I have heard a great deal of the sins of Text-Book Committees, in regard to the prescription of Text-Books, from all kinds of persons occupying positions of responsibility and irresponsibility. I must confess that this criticism of the prescription of excessive quantities of reading matter I have heard virtually for the first time and from Mr. Raman Menon. I might, however, admit that if it be a question of the quality of the reading matter prescribed, there may be valid grounds for difference of opinion. I have been now and then told by persons better able to judge of our vernacular literature than I am that there are occasional lapses in the prescription of reading matter of more difficult content than a particular class can manage. But this criticism has been in regard to isolated cases. I have had the assurance of competent authorities that now-a-days we are getting every year not only books which are in no way inferior in quality to those prescribed in former years but in many cases we are getting books of distinctly superior quality. This opinion has been reinforced by that of a number of persons occupying distinguished places as critics of Malayalam literature and makers of Malayalam Literature whom I have had the opportunity to consult.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): May I know from Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar, whether there is any instance in which the decision arrived at by the Text-Book Committee has been interfered with by the Government?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): I am afraid, Sir, that that question should not have been put to me. I am not in possession of the Departmental facts. I am only discussing the question from the standpoint of the Committee which has been attacked. I am not myself aware, however, of any instance in which Government have interfered with the decision of the Text-Book Committee. It may or may not have taken place. My point is, however, that this question is somewhat irrelevant. The question is not whether there has been interference by the Government or by the Director, but whether such interference has or has not been in the interests of proper prescription. It is not interference that we ought to deprecate but only interference which ends in the prescription of less worthy text-books for more worthy text-books or prescriptions which defeat the ideals which the Text-Book Committee should have before it.

To resume, my argument, Sir, I say again that nobody on the side of the Text-Book Committee objects to criticism. We welcome all criticism. Nothing would keep our Text-Book Committees better tuned up than constant vigilance on the part of the Educational Department and on the part of the Government. Text-Book Committees

must be prepared for such criticisms and must be ready to answer such criticisms.

Now, Sir, in regard to right quality and quantity of text-books to be prescribed, there is a third point which the Text-Book Committee has to consider. It has to see not only that the books it recommends are of the proper quality and that the reading matter recommended is not excessive in volume or deficient in volume, but it has to see that they are not beyond the means of the students. One of the duties of the Text-Book Committee is to see that consistently with the quality and the amount of the reading matter to be prescribed the books prescribed are the cheapest available. I may say that this is one of the aspects to which considerable attention was paid and has been paid by both our Text-Book Committees. I am told that one of the usual duties of the Vernacular Text-Book Committee is to try and discover how far the prices asked for the books can be reduced by negotiation without unduly penalising the authors. The Vernacular Text-Book Committee tries to reduce the prices of the books selected as much as possible. I have been favoured with figures which show the manner in which prices have been so reduced. For example a book for which 28 Chuckrams was charged by the author was recently asked to be sold for 20 Chuckrams. This was agreed to. Another book for which 20 Chuckrams was asked for had to be sold ultimately for 17 Chuckrams. The price of a third book was reduced from 14 Chs. to 10 Chs. Mr. Raman Menon himself as the author of a fourth book *had* to agree to the reduction of its price from 18 Chuckrams to 14 Chuckrams though having a proper estimation of his own work in his own view the price of 18 Chuckrams was the proper estimate of the value of this book. I am not divulging a secret, Sir, when I say that when this reduction was proposed, Mr. Raman Menon manfully stood up, like John Ruskin, for the rights of the author and held that people who wanted to read his books must be prepared to pay prices which he considered reasonable. Ultimately as the Text-Book Committee and the Education Department were adamant and insisted upon the reduction, and Mr. Raman Menon agreed to it. I am sure that in agreeing to this reduction Mr. Raman Menon has conferred a great benefit on our students. I shudder to think of the consequences if Mr. Raman Menon had been less reasonable and had refused to reduce the price of the book and the Text-Book Committee had been obliged to forego the prescription of a book of his. There is a fifth case which illustrates the independence of the Text-Book Committee. It refers to a work by Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai, himself a member of the Text-Book Committee. With characteristic patriotism he fixed the price of his book at *Sirkar* Re. 1 - though another person would ask for *British* Re. 1. The Text-Book Committee in the presence of Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai and without any consideration for his feelings reduced its price to $\frac{3}{4}$ S. Re. and the decision was upheld. I do not know whether Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai smiled in his genial fashion when the price of the book was so reduced and the profits of the author and publisher were reduced by over 25 %. But I know this, that he did not complain of the reduction!

[Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.]

After the reduction of the price of the book by the Text-Book Committee, the Director of Public Instruction also applies his shears on some occasions. He does so because he gets all kinds of information. One of the things that a person often gets in Travancore without paying for it is anonymous advice. We all receive such advice even if we are not Heads of Departments. The Director of Public Instruction being the head of an important Department probably gets more of it than others. It is not unlikely he gets it in regard to alleged profiteering in books. I presume, at least that he has his happy share of these little attentions from public spirited people who prefer to blush unseen and not to disclose their identity. I presume also that he is told pretty promptly of any attempted cases of raising the prices of books. Being human, the Director tries to satisfy himself by enquiries as to the truth of the charges in spite of the inclination to consign anonymous letters to the waste paper receptacle. It is then that he applies his shears and reduces the prices even after they have already been reduced by the Text-Book Committee.

The result ultimately is that what remains for the author is a bare minimum profit. The efficiency of this reduction in the prices of our text books is indicated in a remarkable manner by the gradual reduction in the number of books submitted for the consideration of the Text-Book Committee in recent years. Once upon a time, in the old unregenerate days when the English and the Vernacular Text-Book Committees were one and united and I was a member of the unbifurcated Committee, the Vernacular members used to have whole almyrahs of books flung at their heads year after year. Now-a-days, however, I am told that *all* the sections of the Vernacular Text-Book Committee do not get in a whole year books which can fill a single almyrah, let alone the language section. Formerly they required weeks after weeks to get through books placed before them. Now, I understand from one or two of my colleagues who are on the Vernacular Text Book Committee that the work has got to be got through expeditiously and that the final meetings for the selection of the books do not extend over two short mornings. Formerly, there was so much competition among authors to elbow each other out. Now in many cases the books that are wanted are not proffered. Nevertheless in the competition of the Vernacular Text-Books, especially for non-detailed reading, there are so many good books chosen and the merits of so many books are so nearly balanced that it is not an easy task to choose between them, and the book which is rejected is often nearly as good as the book which has been chosen. But when a person proffers a book for consideration he has to complete its publication. That is, he has undergone all the expenditure necessary to bring an adequate edition out. What is his remedy if his book is thrown out in favour of another of about the same quality? He has to face a certain loss, because outside the schools there is not much disposition to patronise literature as literature. Consequently, when an author approaches the Text-Book Committee with a

statement of price he has got to do so with the hope of reimbursing himself from the savings of his books *if prescribed* for the losses he has incurred or might incur had not the books been prescribed. An important element, therefore in the price of text-books is that which constitutes an insurance against losses. In the case of text books the percentage of the price which ought to be set apart to cover this insurance has got to be greater than in the case of books sold merely as literature.

Mr. Raman Menon suggested an arbitrary standard by which the prices of all text-books should be fixed. For one thing, he makes no allowance for this element of insurance. Nor am I aware that his methods will commend themselves to anyone engaged in book production. I am astonished that so experienced an author as Mr. Raman Menon should have made such suggestions for estimating the values of books. I am not aware of any part of the world where books are produced on commercial lines and such extreme principles are accepted for determining their value. If you accept Mr. Raman Menon's data, I ask: "Are you going to charge books of first rate poetry at the same rate as fourth rate prose? Are you going to charge the same price for a reprint of an old Gazette as for an equal quantity of printed poetry which would create an epoch in literature? Are you to pay the same price for the same quantity of copyright and non-copyright matter whether of the first or of the fourth quality?" I maintain that if you are not going to pay authors satisfactorily you will not protect them and thereby encourage them. If the authors have not property worth anything there is no harm in giving protection because by absence of sale the protection will be un-needed. On the other hand if they are worth anything at all they are justly entitled to protection. Mr. Raman Menon's uniform standard has to be applied in the same way to good literature and bad literature and no literature. He would apply his yard or square inch measurement, based on the area of printing matter, to all books independently of their quality. There is no question in his standard of even the get-up of the text-books, of the paper used, of the type used, of the quality of the printing, of its legibility and of its beauty any more than of the quality or the substance of the book. He has fixed prices all through by his arbitrary standard irrespective of every material and relevant consideration.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): May I point out that I have fixed only the maximum prices of books?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): Just so. But we also know from our experience that all authors, including such authors as Mr. Raman Menon, will always insist upon seeing the maximum price they can obtain accepted by the Text-Books Committee. The author of a book which enjoys a copyright is a monopolist. In Economics we know that, under the law by which monopoly values are fixed, all monopolists charge the highest rates they can obtain consistently with the highest net profit. Vakils for example do not accept half the fees which they can get out of their clients. All monopolists charge the highest net market rate.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolan*): Cannot Government purchase the copyright of these books and publish them?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): Nothing can please authors more than that Government should purchase the copyright of the books. I have been told that even so early as 50 years ago Sir Seshiah Sastry used to say that one of the thriving industries in Travancore was to get Government lands at private registry and then to sell the lands back to the Government at a profit.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolan*): Is this reference to the sale of land relevant? My question was about copyright?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): It is quite relevant, Sir. My point is that there will be another industry similar to that to which Sir Seshiah Sastry alluded. If you accept Mr. Joseph's suggestion, it will be the sale of unsaleable copyrights to Government and making a profit by it.

To pass on, Sir, I might say that I am not in a position to know the mind of Government on this interesting suggestion and to say what attitude they would take towards it. But I know what I would do if I had the disposal of this question. Consequently, speaking as one Economics man to Mr. Joseph as another Economics student, I would say that no Government in the world has hitherto undertaken the purchase of the copyright of books and has undertaken the publication of literature best left to private agency. Wherever Governments have found that suitable books have not been published they have indeed undertaken the publication themselves especially if by doing so they can cut down the prices. This is the case with blue books and official literature and sometimes even text-books in which large profits can be made without much effort and by keeping up suitable prices. This is what has been done in Travancore also. But Government acted in this manner in accordance with correct economic principles as regards the publication of Malayalam Readers. They kept their own copy-right originally and subsequently got the readers published by an outside firm under a guarantee and more recently they have undertaken the publication of decent readers themselves profiting by the experience of the outside firm. The result is that our present Malayalam Readers, which are admitted to be superior in quality and subject matter to the older readers, are even sold at lower prices than those which are published under Government guarantee by Messrs Macmillan.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Cannot they make the same arrangement in regard to Malayalam Books?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): Now, there is this difficulty. Many of our books, whatever the authors might think of them, are not first class literature. Our readers are not mere anthologies containing selections from non copy-right books. There may be here and there a book which is an anthology but

even there we have yet, so far as I know, no anthology in Malayalam corresponding in quality to the English Golden Treasury of Lyrics. The publication of such an anthology might pay a private publisher but it is doubtful if it will pay Government. In a matter of this kind a Government will have less experience than a private undertaker and a Government will stand to lose in negotiating prices and terms in such cases. In the case of books whose sales cannot be calculated before hand even experienced publishers find difficulty in fixing an outright price for the copyright. That is why they publish books by such arrangements as the Half profits arrangement or the Royalty arrangement. I would in this connection recommend the members of this House to study a recent and well-known book by a great English publisher Mr. Unwin entitled 'The Truth about Publishing' which shows the difficulties under which the work of publication is done and the delusion of large profits supposed to be made by publishers. He refers, for instance, to the small estate covering barely ten thousand pounds which a very well-known publisher who had popularised literature and cheapened it considerably and published more than 2000 books left after a successful life of publication. If members will read this book they will find how little Government will stand to gain by risking the tax-payer's money in such matters. I have paid some attention to this subject and I was pleasantly surprised to find my conclusion borne by the experience of Mr. Unwin.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolam*): Sir, it is more than 20 minutes since the speaker began.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal College of Arts*): If you desire it, Sir I will stop.

PRESIDENT. It is just two minutes over.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): Sir, I will wind up. All that I have endeavoured to say is that what the Text-Book Committee have to do is to see that the books they recommend for prescription are of proper quality, that the quantity of matter prescribed is not more nor less than that which would keep the students busy throughout the whole school year, that the prescribed books are reasonably cheap and that they are properly printed and bound, so as not to strain the eye sight of the students and compel them prematurely to wear glasses and to strain their pockets by premature wear and tear, that they are sufficiently numerous and varied in character and reading content so as to enable them to be studied without inducing monotony and so as to lead to the cultivation, in the students, of habits of wide reading and self study. Now, considering that all Malayalam prose is copyright matter and that all modern Malayalam poetry is equally copyright, and considering also that authors like labourers are worthy of recognition, and that every one has not the same chance of getting text-books written by him recognised, even if it be good text-books, and that consequently a suitable allowance has to be made for possible loss after

[Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.]

publication by not getting a book prescribed, it is not surprising that the price at which a prescribed Malayalam text-book can be sold has to be kept fairly *above* that which it would cost to produce a mere *reprint* of that book *after* it is prescribed as text-book. We have also to consider the dangers of an evasion of the intentions of those who prescribe non-detailed reading. If too few books are prescribed it leads to starvation in point of information and subject matter on the part of the students, leading teachers to the vicious habit of supplementing such books by the dictation of notes and cribs, and annotations. There is also the corresponding danger that by prescribing an excessive number of books the objects of non-detailed study may be defeated by the production of summaries and cribs which the student will use, because they are cheap, in preference to reading original books themselves. I am not prepared to say that in the case of *every* book that has been prescribed by the Text-Book Committee all these ideals of correct quality, correct amount of reading matter and correct price have been attained. Opinions may differ on this point. I am not competent to judge of these, while there are on the other side of the House a number of experts, some of them members of the Text-Book Committee like my esteemed friend Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai, himself a distinguished author, and like Mr. Kunjuraman, who are more competent to judge of these things than I am. I would be content therefore to abide by their opinion in a case of this character rather than accept unhesitatingly lay criticisms which proceed, as Mr. Raman Menon's has done, upon insufficient information, vague and confused ideas and upon a general widespread prejudice. I hope therefore that Mr. Raman Menon will not press the point and attempt to apply an arbitrary limit to both the quality and the quantity of the reading matter prescribed and the price of such reading matter, but will leave these questions to be settled, as they have hitherto been done, by the experts of the Text-Book Committee. I would therefore appeal to the House not to be led away by the passion which Mr. Raman Menon imported into his speech, by his transparent conviction, in the righteousness of his cause, but to judge of the evil consequences of accepting his *full* proposal and his baseless assertions. Whatever might be its opinion in regard to the defects of the work of the Vernacular Text-Book Committee in regard to small details of administration my submission is that there has been no warrant for the assertions of Mr. Raman Menon, and I trust that the House would not be led away by the general atmosphere of prejudice he has created and accept this unworkable and mischievous resolution.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): How is this proposal mischievous, Sir?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): I must repeat my adjective, Sir. The acceptance of this resolution will be mischievous; it would even be pernicious, because if it is

accepted it will lead to the prescription of bad books, the rejection of good books and would defeat the real object of education. Nothing can be more mischievous, more pernicious.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): The member said that the various branches of the Text-Book Committee consists of experts. Would the Government be justified in interfering with their decision?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): Have I stated anything Sir, which would indicate that the Government also do not possess this expert knowledge? Have I asserted that the number of available experts is monopolised by the Text-Book Committee? Are there no experts outside the Text-Book Committee whom the Government can consult? Does the responsibility for prescription lie on the Committee alone? Has not the Government a larger responsibility and therefore the obligation to frame its final decision by a consultation if need be, of a wider circle of experts than those on the Text-Book Committee?

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): Sir, there is a good deal of truth in what Mr. Raman Menon has been saying about the penalties imposed upon students by the large number of text-books which were being prescribed and the unjustifiable prices put upon these text-books. But though I am not in very close touch with these matters now, I am bound to say that during the past few years there has been a considerable improvement in this respect. I can speak from personal experience of what happened a few years ago. I was a teacher myself and for several years I was a member of the Text-Book Committee and I was also an author of some books which have been prescribed as text-books. In all these respects I felt that there was a tendency to victimise students and secure money for some people. I am bound to say that it resulted in scandals and a few people being enriched enormously at the expense of the school-going population. Very violent protests were heard in the Popular Assembly as well as in other places. All these had effect and I have some consolation to know that things are steadily improving. All kinds of flimsy publications have been foisted upon the devoted heads of pupils. But I have great pleasure in bearing my testimony to the unique excellence of the text-books which have been recently got out by a competent committee under the orders of Government. But still I think things deserve looking into. It was during the time of Dr. Mitchel that a rule was made that every pupil should have a certain number of note-books. I think a pupil was bound to have ten or twelve or fifteen note books and in some cases the school authorities were in the habit of making it a trading proposition. Some teachers or managers or some of those who could bring any influence to bear upon schools published exercise books and these were foisted upon the heads of students. Some of these were sufficiently bad. If a calculation is made of the amount of money that a student had to spend on these I think it will reveal a scandalous state of things. Though cheap education is provided, pupils are obliged to pay much more for these flimsy note books

[Mr. K. C. Mammen Mappillai.]

than by way of fees. I for myself do not consider such a large number of note-books are absolutely necessary. They were the foibles of a former head of the Department.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): How are the note-books relevant to the discussion, Sir?

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): Yes, pupils have to incur heavy expense in purchasing the large number of note-books. Whatever the relevancy the object of Mr. Raman Menon is what I care for, and I trust that the department will look into the matter and reduce the burden upon the pupils.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Sir, I very strongly support the resolution because I see in the resolution a sign-post in the right direction. If the resolution does not provide for a satisfactory system of selecting text-books, still it shows how to avoid a scandalous system now prevailing in the department. If this resolution could be taken as a vote of censure upon the department in regard to the selection of text-books, whether the committee or the Director or the Government be responsible, whoever might be responsible, if this might be taken as an indication of a vote of censure on the Government, I am entirely one with Mr. Raman Menon.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): Is it only as a vote of censure that he supports it.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): I support the resolution as a concrete form of the expression of this House. The Government should invite tenders from first class firms for the supply of books. If only Government make use of their productions there is no use of saying that they will not be prepared to give their text-books any value that might be set upon them.

To say that the price of a book is too low is quite a different matter for modification. If a sum is fixed and then authors are invited, then I am sure a number of authors would come. I think it is open to Government to select from out of them. All that Mr. Rangaswamy Aiyangar has been saying, I am sure, has no reference to the conditions that now exist in Travancore. He has been speaking about the 1st class poetry and 1st class prose prescribed. I do not know of Mr. Vallathole's or Mr. Kumaran Asan's books being prescribed. They were not generously prescribed at all by the Government. What I say, Sir, is, that schools are made the dumping grounds for all sorts of books whether good, bad or indifferent. That is the only criterion. Another point for consideration is, the amount of influence that an author has to the members of the Text-Book Committee or with the Government directly. That is a matter for highest censure. I do not want to take up the time to stress the point. I only say that whatever may be the insufficiency of the provision that is made here, it provides a sign-post in the right direction. If we mind, we can certainly make some suitable

arrangement to obviate and do away with the present scandalisation and then make the text-books really useful for children and not a source of expenditure to the students and their parents.

MR. K. SIVARAMA PANIKKAR (*Shertallai*): May I know from the member whether he thinks that there is any proportion between the text-books prescribed for one class in Vernacular schools and the corresponding class in the English schools. Say for example the text-book prescribed in the 9th class in a Vernacular school and VI form in an English school.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): I understand the rationale of the question. If I were responsible for this resolution, I would accept the resolution and then invite statistics from a small committee to fix up rates. But I am not prepared here to discuss whether 14 chucks is enough for a preparatory class text-book or Re. 1 Chs. 7 is enough for another text-book. Then I will try to find out what would be the reasonable minimum price for each text-book.

MR. K. SIVARAMA PANIKKAR (*Shertallai*): Is the member aware that in English Schools vernacular subject is taught as an optional subject and in vernacular schools *vice versa*.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): I accept that information. What next?

MR. K. SIVARAMA PANIKKAR (*Shertallai*): What about prices?

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): The prices of text books are quite disproportionate. The price of VI Form text-book does not come up to the price of text-books for IX Class. So I request the Government to accept the resolution and then try to make it as a workable proposition. They must invite opinions from people who have got practical experience with regard to these things. There may be ever so many details to be discussed and settled. There is the printing, quality of paper, binding, fixing of prices and all that. We want expert opinion on these points. I may also point out what Mr. Raman Menon wants is that there must be a certain minimum fixed and he is not very particular since he says that it may not exceed the amount shown.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Are there not variations in the price of text-books?

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): I once more request Government to accept the resolution of Mr. Raman Menon as it is.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I presume that my friend Mr. A. K. Pillai has resumed his seat definitely.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Yes.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): With respect to the resolution before the House I am very sorry I do not find my way to accept the resolution as it is in spite of the vehement characterisation of the existing state of affairs by my friend Mr. A. K. Pillai as 'scandalous and so forth.' The resolution of Mr. Raman Menon is confined only to a very small belt of educational activities in Travancore namely from the preparatory class to Form VI and then from class V to class IX. It deals

[Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai.]

only with respect to Vernacular text-books not with respect to English text-books, not with text-books prescribed in subjects such as History, Geography, Mathematics or other subjects. Mr. Raman Menon finds therefore matter for criticism only with respect to Vernacular text-books excluding grammar. Now in passing, he also observed that the Text-Book Committee comes in for a share of this criticism, that is to say, the Vernacular branch of the Text-Book Committee. Evidently my friend does not understand the scope of the Text-Book Committee's activities in the matter of prescribing text-books for, they do not prescribe text-books now-a-days but only accept approved books and reject unapproved books. From the approved list of books it is the Director or some other educational officer that prescribes the necessary text books, may be with the approval of Government. Such being the case, the charge that the Text-Book Committee is responsible for the selection of text-book is not correct.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): Did I make such a statement?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I think my friend said that the Text-Book Committee prescribes text-books.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Does not the final voice rest with the Text-Book Committee?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): No. As a body of experts they go through the books submitted to the Committee, take exceptions to certain books on grounds of language, style and the presentation of the subject or the subject matter itself and then reject the unapprovable books, accept the approvable books, make a list of those books, and send them up to the Director. Their function ends there.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): Do not the Committees take up the question of price to be fixed for each book and make a recommendation?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Yes. They consider the question of prices to be fixed for each book and make their own recommendation with respect to that to the Director.

MR. C. P. THOMAS (*Nominated*): Has the Text-Book Committee members anything to do with the fixing of price?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): They suggest what price may be fixed for each book.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Are there not definite terms of reference to the Committee.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Yes, there are. These definite terms are accepted by the Committee and the members do their work accordingly. The rest of the activity is within the sphere of educational authorities.

MR. KURANDIPALLIL R. RAMAN PILLAI (*Quilon*): കമ്മിറ്റിക്കാൾ

സമീകരിക്കാത്ത പുസ്തകങ്ങൾ ഗവർണ്മെന്റിൽ നിന്നും സമീകരിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടോ ?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): In so far as the language section is concerned where I am a member, that seldom happens. So then as my friend Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar pointed out some of the members of the Text-Book Committee themselves who are authors of certain books keep quiet when other members fix the price of approved books because they cannot vote when a matter appertaining to them comes up for consideration, and their learned colleagues do the process of amputation here and there with respect to the price demanded by publishers. Such has been the past history with respect to the Committee and the fate of the authors who happen to be there as members of the committee as well. With respect to the work of the Committee and the quality of books that are prescribed my friend Mr. Raman Menon has nothing to say. The gentlemen who supported Mr. Raman Menon dragged in also the previous history which is foreign to the present discussion, and said that all manner of useless publications used to be thrust on the heads of the students. Why this is referred to, I do not know except that it may be a pleasure to make reference to the previous members of the Text-Book Committee most probably in recollection of previous disappointments. Except for that purpose why that should have been referred to, I fail to see. With respect to that I may submit Sir, on the quality of the books prescribed, I did not hear Mr. Raman Menon whisper a single word.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): May I ask Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai to state from his knowledge whether first rate poetry and prose text-books are prescribed ?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I am coming to Mr. A. K. Pillai's observation. With respect to that I do not know what is first rate poetry or prose according to him. All the same I deny his statement. His is a very strident criticism well fortified by his own ignorance.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): What I said was 'Not to my knowledge any of these first rate text-books are prescribed.' To your knowledge I may remind that it is only another form of saying that, not to the knowledge of the public.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Quite so to the knowledge of Mr. A. K. Pillai and to the knowledge of the public as he pictures it. Anyhow, he does not know—

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): I know the text-books prescribed now-a-days are not first rate books. Such books are studiously avoided just because the authors of those books did not come on a mission of crow-catching.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I do not know according to Mr. A. K. Pillai whose book should be considered as first class and whose books are not to be regarded as first class. That is a controversial matter.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): What about crow-catching referred to by Mr. A. K. Pillai?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): What he means by that is not clear I fail to understand the real significance of that. I can only imagine what Mr. A. K. Pillai means. There is nothing to be gained by crow-catching at the instance of any except the crow caught, about the function of the Committee I may state that such of the books as are submitted to them are carefully scrutinised. The members divide them into two sets and no body can gain anything by crow-catching and no body would lose any thing by that. So if Mr. A. K. Pillai could have found out some blemish in any of the poetry pieces prescribed or in any of the prose pieces prescribed, I could have understood the force of his argument.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Kerunagapalli*): I challenge that statement. I can prove my statement provided I have every opportunity afforded to me.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Then it will be time for me to consider Mr. A. K. Pillai's points. As it is we have got a general statement that to his knowledge first rate poetry is not prescribed. We have to take into consideration whether the translation of Shakespheare or Kalidasa is to be prescribed for preliminary classes as the best poetry available I shall leave it entirely to the discretion of the members of this House.

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): കമ്മിറ്റി കാരടെ മുമ്പാകെ വരുന്ന പുസ്തകങ്ങളെ മാത്രമേ തിരഞ്ഞെടുക്കാവൂ എന്ന് അങ്ങോട്ട് ?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): That is our function.

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): കമ്മിറ്റിക്കാർ ഒന്നാംതരം ഗ്രന്ഥകർതാക്കന്മാരുടെ പുസ്തകമേ തിരഞ്ഞെടുക്കാവൂ എന്ന് അങ്ങോട്ട് ?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): It is not in our sphere at all. On such of the books as are sent to us we record our opinion. It is not our business to go out of the way in selecting books for the Government.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): May I know whether the Text-Book Committee sends up a list of books recommended to be prescribed for each class?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): We do not prescribe text-books but we approve that such and such books may be prescribed for certain classes.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): Perhaps you recommend that such and such books should be prescribed?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Not even that. We have simply to say whether certain books can be prescribed for any particular standard.

Such being the case, the charge that the Text-Book Committee has been excluding first rate poetry as text-books I think is an observation without any basis, without any knowledge of the work of the Committee, and without any knowledge of what is actually transpiring in the Committee's consideration.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I know the illustration from the member himself?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): According to him whether Vallathol Narayana Menon's or Kumaranasan's verse is first rate poetry is the sort of question.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I know from the member whether he is responsible for approving certain text books.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): That is for literary criticism and that is not relevant to the discussion here.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): May I know to whom the books are sent?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Books are sent to the Secretary of the Committee who is a representative of the Government.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): Is it at the instance of the Government or the applicants concerned?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Books are sent to the Committee at the instance of the Government direct.

We are asked to go through the books.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): Do Government themselves take the initiative or the authors concerned?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Generally the Government don't directly send any book to the Committee. These books are sent to the Secretary of the Text-Book Committee who is a Government Officer and through him books are Circulated.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolum*): On whose application will Government forward them to the Committee?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Such books as are received by the Government will be sent to us.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): Is there any rule that only books approved by the Text-Book Committee should be prescribed for Schools.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I do not know. With respect to the merits of the works to be rather prescribed there is nothing suggested in Mr. Raman Menon's resolution before the House. His supporters thought they are in a position to adjudge the merits of the books now prescribed and by general allusion to some of the books they would say that they are not worth so much and on that score also they would support Mr. Raman Menon. As to Mr. Raman Menon's position this is what we see. He has prescribed a sort of procrustean bed with respect to the prices of the books to be prescribed. Now he has fixed a particular standard of books which will have to be fitted in all classes whether convenient to be fitted in or not. Sir, that is a very hard proposition of Mr. Raman Menon.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Is the member aware that nationalised Germany provides maximum prices for text-books that must be used by students in the schools?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I am quite unaware of that.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): It is not the Soviet Government but a national Government like ours that provides maximum prices.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I am aware that there are other Governments that do not prescribe like that. Why therefore in this particular instance the example of Germany should be followed I fail to see. The price would depend upon the nature of the matter, the get up of the work and all that. Suppose in one year you prescribe a book and another year a better book is available in the market is it necessary that this procrustean standard should be kept by the Government and never departed from. My friend suggested the possibility of Government purchasing the copyright of books. That I submit is hardly business-like. Suppose this year Government purchase the copyright of one book and another year a better one is available, are the Government going to continue purchasing copyright every year? At that rate where are the Government going to end in purchasing books? They will have to be always keeping stalls of books open and do the business of a salesman. They will have in fact to convert themselves into book sellers.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Who suggested that?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Somebody on this side of the House.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): It was only a question put by somebody.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I thought it was a suggestion.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovola*): Have not the members any standard before their mental eye?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Yes.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovola*): Cannot they measure it in terms of money?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): That will depend upon the nature of the work, get up of the book, the number of pages printed, illustrations arranged, and all that.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I know from the member with regard to the subject matter to be discussed, could it not be thought of in terms of money.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): That is rather difficult. It is only an educational standard.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): What I mean is with regard to the text-books to be prescribed for classes, could not they be measured in terms of money?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Money standard cannot be fixed, but an educational standard can be fixed and the best book which is available to meet that particular standard will have to be prescribed. If you have to pay more for the best book on that account you have to pay. After all, considering the expense side by side with other text-books, is it not a flea-bite—this matter of Vernacular text-books used in the Schools? For other books, for example History, Geography or Mathematics, you are prepared to pay any amount. But when it comes to a question of Vernacular books you want the price to be fixed very low because the authors have the sin to belong to Malabar.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): It is a question of lingual patronage?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): The criticism that last year the authors were paid only so much, this year they need not be paid more that the publisher need not be paid so much, and so forth does not arise in regard to English publications or any other publications. That, I beg to submit, is a sort of morbid sensation, present to the mind of people of some peculiar mentality, and I am sorry, Sir, that this sort of criticism should be urged against the writers in the Vernacular languages alone, to the effect that their books should be rated at what other people settle once for all.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): May I remind Mr. Narayana Pillai that in regard to History, Mathematics and Geography there is no compulsion whatever that the students should buy particular books and therefore there is wide scope for selection?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Books are prescribed for various subjects and I am not prepared to accept the assurance of Mr. A. K. Pillai that only Vernacular text-books are compulsorily prescribed and no other text-books. In these circumstances, Sir, to select a very narrow strip of text books—the Vernacular text-books as they are called in the resolution and to make that the subject of a resolution before this House, excluding all other considerations, by fixing an immutable standard value for all books hitherto existing and hereafter to be produced, is a measure, quite visionary if it does not appear so to the other members of this House, I am sorry, I at any rate shall oppose as far as I can.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (Tovala): May I know from the member if I am correct in inferring that according to him because there is no criticism against the English text-books the criticisms against the vernacular text-books are not justified?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (Ambalapuzha): No. This criticism implies to any on-looker that so far their prices are very moderate and acceptable but with respect to the Vernacular text-books you have been soaring far too high in the air.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli): Does it follow?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (Ambalapuzha): That certainly is the implication in effect. The expression of the one thing is the exclusion of the other or as it is called *expressio unis est exclusio alterius*.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli): Sir, in regard to the points urged against the resolution, I should like to remove, certain misconceptions. Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai was saying that my speech implies some reflection on the Text-Book Committee. That is far from my mind. I expressly stated that I do not apportion any blame to the Committee in these matters. The facts are there. They call for some action and the action should be taken. I did not make any reflection upon the Text-Book Committee. That is not within the scope of the resolution now before the House. That will have to be made on a different occasion. It has to be remembered that the rules are such that the resolution will have to be confined to one point. If various points are taken up, the resolution will be disallowed by the President. That is also a matter which I wish to bring to the notice of Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai. I have no spite or any grudge against a particular branch of the Text-Book Committee, namely the Vernacular branch or any other. I have dealt with the prices of Vernacular text-books. I acknowledge that there may be complaints or grievances about text-books in other subjects also. I have not the least objection to any member bringing forward resolutions upon such subjects and I shall be glad to support them if they are justified by facts. From the figures quoted by me it is quite certain that the present prices, of Vernacular text-books, at least in some of the classes, are very high. In the Fifth form it goes to more than Rs. 6 for vernacular text books alone. I do not know whether for any other subjects, for example English or Geography, the price of the text-books will be so very high. If it is high, that matter also deserves to be looked into, I am at present not concerned with that point.

As regards the connection between the prices of books and the number of books prescribed, I have to say something. Certain requirements are fixed by the course of instruction in prescribing the language text-books for each class so many lines of poetry, so many pages of prose, and so on. In that case, I do not think that the prescribing authorities, whoever they may be—the educational authorities, the Government or the Text-Book Committee will find any difficulty in getting books of the necessary size and it necessarily follows that if only

a few number of text-books are prescribed for each class so as to satisfy the requirements of the courses of instruction, the prices will in fact be more moderate than they are at present. I find that for the Second Form three books are prescribed as text-books. Probably of them one may be poetry and the other two books as prose readers. In addition to this there is a home reader.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): Is not one of them Mr. Raman Menon's own book?

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): In other classes also I think a large number of books, three, four, and sometimes even five, are prescribed for each class. To my mind it seems that that is not in the interests of the boys. But it may be in the interests of the authors. I protest against it. The primary consideration in the prescription of text-books should be the interests of the boys and their guardians and they should not be made to pay more than what is legitimately necessary to satisfy the requirements of the classes.

My friend Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai was saying that the standards I have fixed are rather hard. Well, I have only indicated the maximum prices and the Government are quite free to reduce. I pointed out in the course of my speech that if the requirements in the course of instruction are kept in mind it is quite possible to reduce the price of the books. There is a large amount of freedom for Government in this matter. So, that objection also does not apply.

It was pointed out by the official member that the prices cannot be fixed merely with reference to the quantity or the number of pages, but also with reference to the quality. I say ditto to it. But I also say that it is quite possible to consider the quality also and prescribe higher prices for books of quality within the limits prescribed. That is my submission. There is nothing to be said against the books of good quality being prescribed. Generally I have not seen works of very great genius or requiring very great investigation or anything of the sort prescribed. The authors, I am sure, will be quite amenable and reasonable if they are asked to sell their books at a reasonable price. In my small way I am also a writer of books and one or two of my books have been prescribed in the past and at present also there is a book of mine which is prescribed. I was asked by a member of the Text-Book Committee whether I was prepared to sell the book at a certain price. I immediately agreed and I caused it to be sold, with a greater number of pages of the book, at the price fixed. I think that will be the case more or less with other authors also, because even then they will be able to make a fair profit but it will be an honest profit and not at the unjust expense of the pupils and their guardians. I have not requested the Government to undertake the publication of books. As regards good printing, fairly good printing is now insisted upon by the Government and also by the Text-Book Committee. Otherwise, the books may not be approved of. All these requirements can be completely satisfied even if my resolution is fully

[Mr. G. Raman Menon]

accepted. Anyhow, what I submit is that there is a great necessity for getting the prices of books fixed for each class at a certain limit. That is what I want.

As regards the plea that the opinion of experts in the matter has to be considered, Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai pointed out exactly what the expert is entrusted with. So the main responsibility rests upon the educational authorities and the Government and it is in their province to see that a proper limit is fixed to the prices of text-books.

I wish also to point out in this connection another instance to show that the prices can be brought down to a very considerable extent from the prices of the text-books at present. For example Tamil books, also a part of the vernacular text-books cost for the preparatory class 15 chackrams 15 cash, for the First Form 24 chackrams 15 cash and for the Second Form 26 chackrams 15 cash. That will be possible in the case of Malayalam books also.

Therefore I submit that there is real necessity for looking into this question and for moderating the prices of the books prescribed for the different classes. With these words I request that the resolution may be accepted by the House.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): Sir, I have not got very much to say in view of the generous extent to which Mr. Raman Menon has moved away from his original position. He has now accepted the view that the books recommended by the Text-Book Committee are *well* printed and *well* got up. He has not challenged the quality of these books. He is not in a position to specify a *single* instance in which an individual book has been over-charged. He has not challenged my position in regard to the necessity for prescribing an adequate amount of literature, so as to prevent cramming and the deterioration of study in the class by the use of substitutes for books such as cribs. He has not challenged *any* of these things. He has also admitted that the Text Book Committee has had no desire to allow authors to make any unfair profits. I was delighted to hear from Mr. Raman Menon that he, and authors who think like him, would be quite willing to make only an honest profit. The only point that we are asked to adjudicate upon, now, is therefore, whether the author patronised by the Committee is making more than this honest gain, and whether the authorities, as those ultimately responsible, are setting their faces against any attempt at profiteering. As I stated at the commencement of my speech, as regards the *quality* of the matter prescribed, I, as a lay man, would accept the opinion of experts. If the Vernacular Text-Book Committee did not consist of experts, I would not have the same confidence in it as I now have. When I get the opinion of a gentleman like Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai, in regard to the quality of a particular piece of Malayalam poetry, even the criticism of my friend Mr. A. K. Pillai leaves my withers unwrung. There are parts of human knowledge in which I would readily defer to Mr. A. K. Pillai, as for example the present condition of Republican Germany or

the Russian Soviet. But when it comes to a question of Malayalam poetry, it will be old fashioned prejudice on my part, but I would defer to Mr. Narayana Pillai, and if Mr. Narayana Pillai and Mr. Kunjuraman say that a certain piece is good poetry I would ordinarily accept it as good poetry and sign a blank declaration in favour of anything they are prepared to say, even if Mr. A. K. Pillai is of another opinion.

Sir, there is thus very little left for me to defend. After conceding everything that I urged, the only thing that Mr. Raman Menon still wants is that his resolution should be accepted, though the implication of this resolution, coupled with his earlier strong expressions in regard to authors like himself as being pick-pockets, might leave the impression that something has been exceedingly wrong, whether it is in the Department of Education or the Government, that somebody has got to be made responsible for it, and that the acceptance of the resolution will amount to a censure on both. Mr. A. K. Pillai, with that engaging frankness of his for which we all admire him, admitted that the resolution is unworkable but urged that it is in the same direction as the Government's action in defeating profiteering, as it only tries to give a concrete shape to what the Government has with greater wisdom, been trying to decide each case on its merits. He also said unequivocally that the resolution implies a vote of censure on the Government. If that is the true view that has to be taken of this innocent proposition, there is a difference in the standpoint of its parent and its sponsor, I leave the House to decide upon the question of the responsibility falling upon it if it accepts the view of the Moolakarta and the Vyakhyata.

I think, Sir, that I should say before I sit down that if it is profiteering that Mr. Raman Menon wants to condemn, and if it is efficiency that he wants to be preserved, both are now secured. It may be, as I said, there are individual cases of a book being overcharged. That is inevitable. I think in a case like that, the Government and the Department would be greatly assisted if men like Mr. Raman Menon will draw the attention of the authorities concerned to any case in which excessive prices are charged, having regard to the quality of the matter, the quantity, the get-up and also the availability of equally good books or better books at lower prices. I do not think that anybody would quarrel with such critics. If Mr. Raman Menon had given some constructive criticism of this kind, it would have been much more valuable than his coming forward and saying that three or four books are being prescribed for each class and that the practice should be condemned, irrespective of the length of the books, the purposes for which they are prescribed and, as I said, the manner in which the prescription suits the most modern educational requirements. I may say this in this connection, and I wish to be forgiven for saying so, *viz.*, Mr. Raman Menon's ideas are somewhat out of date in regard to the educational value of modern text-books.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): Has he not conceded all the principles required for modern education?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): He has conceded the principles but he has made a wrong application of them and his resolution is based upon a wrong application of the principles. I trust therefore that the House will show its opinion of the resolution by rejecting it.

I have merely to wind up by just alluding to what the Government has been trying to do to prevent profiteering. It has been undertaking the publication of readers, and as I said before, the present readers are available at lower prices than the readers which a subsidised Firm was producing. Government has prohibited the prescription of books in non-language subjects below Class Four. Vigilance is always shown in considering the excessive number of books not only in the Vernacular Text-Book Committee but also in the English Text-Book Committee. From my own experience as President of the English Text-Book Committee I know that questions are asked as to why a number of books should be prescribed. Sometimes four books have been prescribed and one book has been cut out by the Director of Public Instruction, who, in such a case, acts upon the advice which he receives from persons directly concerned with the schools. If the members of the Committee find that the number of books in a particular year has been found to be excessive they reduce the quantity prescribed for the next year.

Another thing I have got to mention is the question of note-books, to which reference has been made by Mr. Mammen Mappillai. Their excessive use is entirely due to insufficient prescriptions. Cribbs and note-books are naturally caused by defective prescription; if we wish to multiply note-books in our schools we have only to accept Mr. Raman Menon's suggestion to prescribe only one or two books which will leave the student at the mercy of crib makers and note-books makers. I hope that the House will now reject Mr. Raman Menon's proposition.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): May I know whether the Government is prepared to act upon the spirit of the resolution?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): My submission is that the Government have been invariably acting upon the principles that Mr. Raman Menon had unhappily forgotten, when he brought forward this resolution.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): I press the resolution.

The resolution was put to the vote and lost.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): I request that a poll may be taken.

A poll was taken, and the House divided as follows:—

AYES—4.

- | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Mr. Kallur Narayana Pillai. | 3. Mr. G. Raman Menon. |
| 2. „ A. K. Pillai. | 4. „ R. Raman Pillai. |

NOES—28.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. I. C. Chacko. | 16. Mr. R. Padmanabhan. |
| 2. „ Paul Daniel. | 17. „ Kayalam Paramesvaran Pillai. |
| 3. „ R. Dhanukoti Pillai. | 18. „ S. Piraviperumal Pillai |
| 4. „ K. George. | 19. Mrs. M. Poonen Lukose. |
| 5. „ P. Gomatinayagom Pillai. | 20. Mr. K. N. Ramasubba Aiyar. |
| 6. „ P. Habeeb Mahomed. | 21. Rao Bahadur K. V. Ranga- |
| 7. „ N. K. Krishna Pillai. | swami Aiyangar. |
| 8. „ P. N. Krishna Pillai. | 22. Mr. S. C. H. Robinson. |
| 9. „ C. V. Kunjuraman. | 23. „ K. Sivarama Panikkar. |
| 10. „ T. Kumara Pillai. | 24. „ V Subba Aiyar. |
| 11. Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai. | 25. „ M. Subrahmanya Pillai. |
| 12. Mr. L. A. Lampard. | 26. „ C. P. Tarakan. |
| 13. „ P. K. Narayana Pillai. | 27. „ C. P. Thomas. |
| 14. „ M. N. Pillai. | 28. „ A. Vipin. |
| 15. „ N. Nilakanta Pillai. | |

NEUTRALS—6.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. A. J. John. | 4. Mr. K. C. Mammen Mappillai. |
| 2. „ K. I. Joseph. | 5. „ K. P. Nilakanta Pillai. |
| 3. „ C. P. Kochukunju Pillai. | 6. „ M. Sivatanu Pillai. |

The Resolution was declared lost.

The House adjourned at 5-20 p. m. to meet again at 12 noon next day.

P. N. KRISHNA PILLAI,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.